

# **The Disproof of Christianity**

by

**Adam Weishaupt**

**Published by Hyperreality Books at Smashwords**

**Copyright 2011 Adam Weishaupt**

The right of Adam Weishaupt to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the author, except in the case of a reviewer, who may quote brief passages embodied in critical articles or in a review.

## **Quotations**

“Men of simple understanding, little inquisitive and little instructed, make good Christians.” -- Montaigne

“Popular Christianity has for its emblem a gibbet, for its chief sensation a sanguinary execution after torture, for its central mystery an insane vengeance brought off by a trumpery expiation.” -- George Bernard Shaw

“When you want to fool the world, tell the truth.” -- Bismarck

“What defines me, what sets me apart from all the rest of mankind, is that I have *unmasked* Christian morality.” – Nietzsche

## **The Illuminati**

THIS IS ONE OF A SERIES OF BOOKS outlining the religion, politics and philosophy of the ancient and controversial secret society known as the Illuminati, of which the Greek polymath Pythagoras was the first official Grand Master. The society exists to this day and the author is a member, working under the pseudonym of “Adam Weishaupt” – the name of the Illuminati’s most notorious Grand Master.

The Illuminati’s religion is the most highly developed expression of ancient Gnosticism and is called Illumination (alternatively, Illuminism). Dedicated to the pursuit of enlightenment, it has many parallels with the Eastern religions of Hinduism, Buddhism and Taoism. It rejects the Abrahamic religions of faith: Judaism, Christianity and Islam, considering these the work of the “Demiurge”; an inferior, cruel and wicked deity who deludes himself that he is the True God, and who has inflicted endless horrors on humanity.

If you wish to judge for yourself how deranged the Demiurge is, you need only read the Old

Testament, the story of the Demiurge's involvement with his "Chosen People", the Hebrews. You may wonder why the "God of All" entered into an exclusive and partisan Covenant with a tribe in the Middle East several thousand years ago, why he promised them a land (Canaan) that belonged to others, and why he then actively participated with them in a genocidal war against the Canaanites. Even more bizarrely, according to Christian theology, he then despatched all of those Hebrews, whom he had supported so fanatically, to Limbo – the edge of Hell – when they died. They couldn't go to Heaven because they were indelibly marked by the "Original Sin" of Adam and Eve. Only the atonement provided by the agonising death of God's "son", Jesus Christ, could wipe the slate clean and allow the Hebrews to be released from Limbo. But there was a catch. Only those who accepted Jesus Christ as their Lord and Saviour were eligible for Paradise.

Of course, the Chosen People of "God" have almost entirely rejected Jesus Christ. Therefore, from the Christian perspective, nearly all of the Chosen People are now in hell proper. Don't you find God's behaviour distinctly odd? Indeed, unbelievable? Don't alarm bells start ringing? Doesn't the behaviour of this God sound rather more like what would be expected of Satan?

Remember that this same "God" ordered Abraham to perform human sacrifice on his own son, Isaac. Abraham, rather than rejecting this monstrous command, rather than denouncing the creature that gave it as evil incarnate, agreed to butcher his own flesh and blood to demonstrate how slavishly and mindlessly obedient he was – the prototype of all psychopathic, fanatical "believers".

Does God's command to Abraham sound like something that would ever pass the lips of the True God? We pity you if you think it does because you are surely a creature of the Demiurge and one of the legions of the damned. If, however, you doubt the credentials of the Abrahamic God, you may be receptive to the message of the Illuminati and our future-oriented, rational, scientific, mathematical and dialectical religion of light – *Illumination*.

## **The Ultimate Lie – Christianity**

CHRISTIANITY, THE MOST SUCCESSFUL religion in world history, is breathtakingly bizarre. Most Christians don't appreciate how bizarre because few of them know anything about the faith they profess. Christian Churches make no attempt to encourage any debate about their dogmas. In fact, historically, to challenge these dogmas in any way brought a charge of heresy, followed by excommunication and often capital punishment.

Virtually every Christian heresy offered a searing and rational critique of orthodoxy and, to combat each one, the Church had to construct an increasingly preposterous, faith-based and unyieldingly dogmatic edifice. None of the arguments of the heretics were refuted; they were simply shouted down, drowned out and buried under specious arguments driven by selective quotations from the infinitely flexible Bible. An alternative set of quotations could just as easily have proved the heretics' cases. So, given that it is forbidden for Christians to analyse their beliefs in any serious, philosophical manner, it falls to us – non-Christians – to do the job for them.

We don't regard Christianity as a religion but rather as a mental disorder. No rational person could subscribe to Christian doctrines. Protestant Christianity openly proclaims its hostility to reason, agreeing with Luther that reason is "the Devil's whore." Although some scientists claim to be Christians, they are invariably ignorant of Christian theology and are betraying the fact that they were brainwashed by Christian parents when they were children. Any professional scientist who seriously promotes Christianity as a respectable, rational system is rightly held in contempt by his colleagues.

We will go through the main Christian beliefs one by one and expose the fallacies on which they are based. The great tragedy is that the enormous brainwashing machine of the Christian Church never reflects on its own absurdity. Faith in irrationality has been sanctified by Christianity. The more insane the proposition, the more the faithful are congratulated for believing in it. In other words, Christians are incentivised to believe nonsense. You are regarded as holier if you subscribe to lunatic assertions without demur.

Anyone who does dare to challenge Christian doctrines quickly abandons Christianity. The act of making the challenge is tantamount to crossing the rational Rubicon. To question a doctrine is to show that your doubts have overcome your faith, and at that stage the game is up. Many Catholics are referred to as "lapsed". What that means is that one day they said to themselves: "I just can't buy into this crap anymore. It's over."

That's how simple it is to get rid of Christian beliefs.

We wish to give all Christians the reasons to cease and desist from worshipping the grotesque

Christian God. We will examine in turn all of the central professions of the Christian faith: the Nicene Creed, the Chalcedon Definition, the Constantinople Anathemas, the Apostles' Creed and the Athanasian Creed. We will, in particular, examine the two conceptual axes around which Christianity turns: the Trinity and the Incarnation of "God the Son" in Jesus Christ. In doing so, we will expose a catastrophic error that Christian theologians perpetrated when it came to the identity of Jesus Christ's "father". This overlooked bombshell constitutes, on its own, the formal disproof of Christianity within that religion's own theological terms of reference.

But let's start with the first formal declaration of the Christian faith: the Nicene Creed of 325 CE. For the first time in your life, read it slowly and carefully, word by word, and reflect on exactly what it's saying. You will be flabbergasted at just how incomprehensible and idiotic it is.

## **The Nicene Creed**

**I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.**

**And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds; God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made.**

**Who, for us men and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Spirit of the virgin Mary, and was made man; and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate; He suffered and was buried; and the third day He rose again, according to the Scriptures; and ascended into heaven, and sits on the right hand of the Father; and He shall come again, with glory, to judge the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end.**

**And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life; who proceeds from the Father and the Son; who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified; who spoke by the prophets.**

**And I believe in one holy catholic and apostolic Church. I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins; and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.**

## **Analysis**

**"I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible."**

Here we have an unambiguous statement that God the Father, not God the Son or God the Holy Spirit, was the Creator. He made heaven and earth, and everything else, whether we can see it or not. Instantly, this is a disturbing assertion from the Christian perspective. If there is only one God in Christianity, why is it the case that only "God the Father" is involved in the process of Creation? What were God the Son and God the Holy Spirit doing? And aren't they supposed to be ONE GOD?

**"And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds; God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made."**

Here we encounter the troubling phrase: "Son of God". Clearly, we are being told that the Lord Jesus Christ is *not* God but, rather, *his son*. So how can he also be God if he is clearly identified as God's son? It's a logical absurdity.

The authors of the Nicene Creed were presented with one of the greatest challenges of all time – to defend the doctrine that the ONE God of monotheism can be regarded as three separate persons: Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

They were fighting two heresies that attacked the concept of the Trinity from two opposite directions, placing the Trinity doctrine in a vulnerable mid-ground where any move would bring it closer to one of the heresies or the other. It had no room for manoeuvre.

The "Arian heresy" asserted that God the Father and God the Son were separate Gods, with the Father being the True God and the Son his first and most special creation. This heresy can be seen in the present day with the Jehovah's Witnesses and Unitarians, both of which religions downgrade Jesus Christ's significance from God to "most special creation". The Arian heresy thus defended monotheism by rejecting the Trinity. (The monotheistic Jews and Muslims also, of

course, reject the Christian Trinitarian doctrine and regard it as preposterous.)

The “Sabellian heresy” asserted that in his relations with humanity, God was perceived to have three separate modes: Father, Son and Holy Spirit. This view defended monotheism by saying that the Trinity was really just a unity perceived as a trinity; a trick of the mind, so to speak. There weren’t actually three different persons in one God but three different modes in which the one God could be perceived by the human mind. The three persons of the Trinity exist only in God’s relation to man, not in objective reality.

So, Trinitarians were forced to find a formula that avoided making the Trinity seem like three modes of a single God and equally avoided any suggestion that differences between the three persons of the Trinity were so substantial that they must be judged as three separate Gods rather than three persons in ONE God.

We are told that the Son of God was “begotten of the Father before all worlds.” If he was begotten at all then it means that there was a time when God the Father existed but God the Son did not, hence God the Son cannot be God since there was a time when he did not exist but God did. Again, it is logically absurd to analyse this sentence in any other way. Some Christian theologians attempt to say that these events happened outside time – i.e. in “eternity” – but this does not change in any way the basic problem that God the Father must have preceded God the Son in order to “beget” him. Neither human time nor eternity makes the slightest difference. This is a question of relation, of which precedes the other. God the Father manifestly preceded God the Son. God the Father WAS when God the Son WAS NOT, so how can they be equivalent?

We are told that God the Son was not “made” i.e. he was not a creation of God the Father (who is described as the maker of all things). God the Son is said to be of “one substance” with the Father and is “God of God”. In modern scientific terms, this might be interpreted as suggesting that God the Son was asexually reproduced by God the Father from the Father’s own substance i.e. God the Son is God the Father’s CLONE. Absolutely no attempt is made to explain why God would want to beget a Son. What possible function could be served by this exercise? Couldn’t God manage things on his own account? Was he lonely? Moreover, if the Father was indeed the maker of all things then it is clear that the clone was not permitted to perform any work of creation, suggesting that he lacked the ability or authority. Either way, it is an asymmetrical relationship between Father and Son, hence they are not equals, hence they are separate Gods, exactly as the “heretic” Arius said. (In truth, Arius’ accusers – the Christian establishment – were the real heretics.)

**“Who, for us men and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Spirit of the virgin Mary, and was made man; and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate; He suffered and was buried; and the third day He rose again, according to the Scriptures; and ascended into heaven, and sits on the right hand of the Father; and He shall come again, with glory, to judge the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end.”**

So, we are told that Jesus Christ came down from heaven for our salvation. The crucial detail is omitted that it was “God” who damned us in the first place, and Jesus Christ is God; hence he is coming to save us from his own deadly decree upon us! He didn’t need to come “down” at all; he simply needed to rescind the original condemnation of humanity for which he was fully and personally responsible. Who is Jesus Christ actually saving us from? From HIMSELF!

We are told that Jesus Christ’s father was the Holy Spirit, who impregnated the “virgin” Mary. No scientific details are furnished as to how this astounding feat was accomplished. How does the Holy Spirit supply the Y chromosome necessary to produce a son? Is the Holy Spirit a genetic engineer?

Jesus, we are informed, was crucified under Pontius Pilate “for us”. But there was no need for such an event if Jesus had simply “forgiven” humanity for whatever it was he thought we’d done wrong. All that was at issue was a trivial act of disobedience by two human beings called Adam and Eve who were told not to eat the delicious fruit of a tree placed directly in front of them. Why was the tree put there if not to seduce them to sin? And why did the actions of two humans condemn the rest of humanity, none of whom had any involvement in the incident since they literally weren’t even born? How is that “moral” and “just”? How can God condemn the unborn to Hell? What does morality mean if you can be condemned to perpetual pain and suffering for actions committed by others?

Humanity was sentenced en masse to eternal Hell. How could that possibly be an appropriate sanction for a crime no one bar Adam and Eve perpetrated? Why did Jesus Christ have to be crucified for any of this? His “sacrifice” was a senseless act for a crime that never was. Adam and

Eve did nothing wicked. They didn't kill or harm anyone. They disobeyed a nonsensical order that should never have been given in the first place. They ate from a tree that was put there precisely for that purpose. They were victims of entrapment and "God" is the one who should be held accountable for what subsequently happened. He intentionally placed temptation in the path of Adam and Eve then condemned them and all their heirs to Hell forever when they were duly tempted. Then, to lift the sentence of Hell, Jesus Christ – a person with a "martyr complex" – arranged to be crucified (i.e. this was an act of divine suicide).

There's no logic in this scenario, but plenty of mental illness. Would YOU behave in this extraordinary way if you were God? So why would God? Imagine you put a delicious bar of chocolate in front of a toddler and ordered him not to eat it then left him alone for half a day. When you returned, would you expect to find the chocolate eaten or not eaten? If eaten, would you sentence the baby to Hell (plus all of its descendants)? Wouldn't that make you a psychopath? Yet that's what "God" did. Doesn't that make him pathological?

In relation to Jesus Christ – a person who allegedly physically returned from the dead – we are told that he "ascended" into heaven. This implies that heaven is a place for physical bodies and that they can be "beamed up". We are told that Jesus Christ will return (be beamed down) in glory, and will judge the "quick and the dead" (implying that he will resurrect them beforehand in order to judge them), and will then establish a kingdom ON EARTH WITHOUT END.

Here we have a doubly disastrous Christian revelation. Firstly, this statement directly contradicts the Book of Revelation that Christ will rule for a thousand years (i.e. *not* without end), prior to Armageddon and the Last Judgment. Secondly, it implies that the resurrected don't go to heaven but remain on Earth under the rule of Jesus Christ. This refutes any notion that human beings have immaterial souls that can exist independently of physical bodies. Resurrection is, according to this creed, a strictly physical process: the soul cannot exist without a physical body.

**"And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life; who proceeds from the Father and the Son; who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified; who spoke by the prophets."**

Now we are confronted with the revelation that the Holy Ghost is responsible for allocating life. God the Father may be the maker of all things, but the Holy Ghost is the bestower of life. We are informed that the Holy Ghost "proceeds" from the Father and the Son. This curious phrase means that he issues forth or originates from the other two. How is such a thing possible? Why wasn't the Holy Ghost a clone of God the Father just as God the Son was? Moreover, how can the Holy Ghost issue forth from TWO persons? And what does it actually mean to "issue forth"? Is he of the same substance as the other two persons, or he is some sort of "force" that they jointly emit? We are told that it is the Holy Ghost who speaks through the prophets. He is therefore the source of divine inspiration (of divine possession, we might say).

The question of from whom the Holy Ghost proceeds became one of the central causes of the schism between Western and Eastern Christianity. The bitter dispute is described by the word *Filioque* (Latin for "and from the Son"). The Roman (Western) text of the Nicene Creed differs from the Greek (Eastern) text. Where the Roman text says that the Holy Ghost proceeds "from the Father and the Son", the Greek says only "from the Father" (and this was in fact the form that appeared in the original version of the Nicene Creed). The *Filioque* clause made its first appearance in 589 CE when it was added to the Creed at the Third Council of Toledo.

The issue is one of whether the Holy Ghost has two origins, or just one. The Eastern Orthodox Church is insistent that God the Father is the sole origin while the approach of the Roman Catholic Church is more nuanced. Acknowledging that the Father ("the principle without principle") is the first origin, Catholics maintain that he is in some way necessarily channelled through the Son in relation to the procession of the Holy Spirit; thus the Father and Son act in such close concert in this context that they are effectively a single principle. Catholics understand the phrase "proceeds from the Father and Son" to mean "from one origin, from the Father through the Son". The significant point is that for the Catholic Church, the agency of Jesus Christ was essential to the nature of the Holy Ghost whereas for the Eastern Orthodox Church, Jesus Christ was not involved in the origination of the Holy Ghost and it was entirely the Father's doing.

The Catholic Church was attempting to make Jesus Christ as important as possible while the Eastern Church was emphasising the primacy of God the Father and the equal significance of the Holy Spirit to Jesus Christ.

What we have here is a scheme that looks extraordinarily like polytheism rather than monotheism. God the Father is unquestionably the primary God: the begetter of the Son and the ultimate origin of the Holy Ghost. They are impossible without him, but he is not impossible

without them, so how can anyone claim that they are equivalent and form a single Godhead?

Whether Christian theologians like it or not, the Christian Trinity is a concept that amounts to the following assertion: there is ONE God – God the Father. He cloned himself from his own substance to “beget” God the Son. He then, through some other means, originated the Holy Ghost (it is not clear how we are supposed to understand the nature of the Holy Ghost; is he a second clone like God the Son, or something else of an undefined kind?).

Christianity is monotheism only in relation to God the Father. God the Son and God the Holy Spirit are sub-Gods. They are not equal to the Father. They are in truth his creations, but their creation proceeds from God’s own substance rather than from out of nothing (as was the case with all the rest of the Father’s creations).

God the Son and the Holy Ghost may be of the same substance as God the Father but they are not his equals. The Trinity is one of the most bogus concepts ever devised. It’s devoid of any intellectual integrity. In truth, it’s monotheism with two sub-Gods. They are not all equal. It’s polytheism, with three gods capable of independent action.

The existence of three Gods (one proper God and two sub-Gods) allows Christianity to be much more flexible than Judaism and Islam. It can tell many more stories than they can and provide a far superior Mythos to those of its rivals. It can do things such as identify God the Son with the prophesied Jewish Messiah. It can talk of the Holy Spirit descending upon the prophets.

“God” becomes a much more fluid concept. It can intervene much more directly in human affairs. When did you ever hear of Allah interacting with human beings? He is permanently remote.

Christianity it is an entirely fraudulent version of monotheism. Islam is monotheism’s true face. Even Judaism is lax, allowing Jehovah to have a *Shekinah* – an earthly presence. This is tantamount to smuggling in another God to increase Jehovah’s scope of action.

It’s incredible how deceitful religions are. They are forever introducing new features that are logically incompatible with what went before. The new features enhance the *Mythos* (story) but destroy the *Logos* (rationality of the religion). No one cares because most people hate logic and reason and find it much easier to understand stories and parables.

With the exception of people like St Augustine and Thomas Aquinas who were Church officials, no first-rate Christian thinker (many of the greatest philosophers in history were nominally Christian) ever attempted to defend mainstream Christian theology. All the great philosophers produced intellectual schemes that were in one way or another fatal to orthodoxy. These philosophies were based on Logos rather than Mythos thinking. Outside philosophical circles, almost nothing is known of these Logos systems. Average people have no interest in them and would much rather stick with the infantile stories that they find emotionally appealing.

Over and over again, our world is destroyed on the anvil of emotion. Yet the truth is a function of reason and logic, not of emotional stories. Sadly, most people are alienated from the truth. They have no relationship with it and nor are they interested. That’s why religion is based on stories and commandments and not on reason and logic.

We are bitter enemies of Christianity, yet we understand it better than any Christian. How many Christians have even heard of the Filioque controversy? Do they actually know or care what they believe? Isn’t there something fundamentally wrong if the enemies of a religion are far better informed about it than its believers? What does that say about the nature of belief?

Belief is a deliberate abandonment of any attempt to approach a subject critically and knowledgeably. Rather, the believer simply announces, “I believe, and now I’ll get on with other things like making loads of money.” At that point, they end all intellectual curiosity (assuming they ever had any) about the religion upon which the eternal fate of their soul depends. One would have to conclude that, deep down, they don’t believe in the soul at all. They want to avoid asking the big questions. They prefer to play video games or watch TV. That’s the supreme tragedy of belief. It’s mental laziness and, at root, it’s UNBELIEF. Anyone who believes in any religion should be expected to know everything about that religion. If they are ignorant about it (as nearly all Christians are) then what is it they actually believe in? It’s certainly not Christianity because they don’t know what that is. Rather, what they believe in is the SIGN SYSTEM of Christianity. This says: “You have a soul. If you believe in Christ you will be saved. Jesus died for your sins and loves you. If you don’t believe in Jesus you will go to Hell.”

That statement, frankly, is all that the average Christian understands of Christianity, and yet every part of the statement is bogus. But who cares? Belief is nothing but a willingness to accept a lazy, easy, comforting set of fake and fraudulent signs.

The Catholic Church asserted that the Filioque controversy arose because the Greek language was less flexible than Latin and the expression used by the Roman Church could not be rendered properly in Greek.

On the subject of the Filioque, Saint Ambrose declared: "When the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, He is not separated from the Father, He is not separated from the Son."

Saint Augustine's take on the matter was: "God the Father alone is He from whom the Word is born, and from whom the Holy Spirit principally proceeds. And therefore I have added the word 'principally', because we find that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son also. But the Father gave Him this too, not as to one already existing, and not yet having it; but whatever He gave to the only-begotten Word, He gave by begetting Him. Therefore He so begat Him as that the common Gift should proceed from Him also, and the Holy Spirit should be the Spirit of both."

So, we are to understand that the Holy Spirit is the "spirit" of both the Father and the Son. But what is this mysterious spirit of two persons that manifests itself as a third person? If it is not "begotten" then how is it produced?

Saint Cyril of Alexandria said, "The Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son; clearly, he is of the divine substance, proceeding substantially in it and from it."

We are forced to conclude that God the Father surrendered some of his substance to "beget" Jesus Christ and that then, according to Catholicism, both the Father and the Son surrendered some of their substance to generate the Holy Spirit, but, according to Eastern Orthodoxy, only the Father surrendered some of his substance to the Holy Spirit, meaning that the Spirit has no direct connection with the Son.

What is for sure is that what Christian Trinitarians mean by monotheism is that God is a substance and no matter how many times that substance is divided up, there is still only one God. Even if God the Father cloned himself a thousand times, there would still only be one God. The divine substance is the important thing, not the separate persons made of that substance. The divine substance ensures that all of the cloned Gods are morally perfect, all knowing, all seeing and infinitely perfect. It is the substance that contains these qualities, and anyone made of this substance inherits the substance's properties.

The Christian statement of monotheism should actually be: there is one GOD SUBSTANCE and it can be divided into any number of GOD PERSONS. The substance is critical, not the persons. All the persons remain indissolubly linked because they share the same substance. They are therefore both Many and One.

Note that none of these Gods can disagree with any of the others. Anything done by one is automatically done by them all since they operate according to the principle of the Three Musketeers: *All for One and One for All*. Consequently, EVERYTHING done by God the Father is equally the responsibility of the Son and the Spirit. The Son and the Spirit are thus *personally* accountable for the endless atrocities described in the Jewish Bible that are normally attributed to Jehovah alone.

The Catholic Church, like the Eastern Church, nevertheless subscribes to the rather worrying "Monarchy of the Father" doctrine. The Catholic Church declares: "[We] recognize that the 'Monarchy of the Father' implies that the Father is the sole Trinitarian Cause or Principle (principium) of the Son and of the Holy Spirit."

In other words, Christianity does in fact acknowledge the primacy of one person of the Trinity, implying that he is a greater God than the other two. Hence it is not a Trinity of equals, hence "God" is not equal, hence this is not monotheism but polytheism, with three Gods in a certain rank to each other. God the Father is the true God, the Son is the secondary God and the Spirit is the least of the three.

The Catholic Church does not say that the Holy Spirit proceeds "jointly and equally" from two principles (Father and Son), but rather: "the Holy Spirit proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son, not as from two principles but as from one single principle". It explains this by saying that the Father is the "principle without principle" and is the first origin of the Spirit. Yet, as Father of the only Son, he is, with the Son, the single principle from which the Spirit proceeds.

Confused? You ought to be. The "Trinity" is mind-bogglingly absurd. How can anyone believe it? Is there one God or three? Are they equal Gods or are some "more equal than others"? Is there a hierarchy of power? Can one God act independently of the others? If they can't act independently, how can any of them be considered all-powerful? The philosophical problems just keep multiplying.

Can you imagine an average Christian church-goer trying to explain all of this? So, we ask again, what actually is it that a Christian believes? They don't believe at all because in order to believe you must first know what it is in which you believe. If you can't state what you have a belief in then what does your belief amount to other than a statement of insanity? You believe quite literally in *God knows what*, because you certainly don't. You can't even define what or who God is.

How many Christians could actually argue against the Arian heresy that Christ is a lesser God

than the Father, hence is not truly God? If God the Father begat God the Son, there is a fundamental asymmetry between the two. The begotten CANNOT be the equivalent of the begetter. Moreover, if the begetter further begets the Holy Spirit and the Son has either no role or an intermediate role in this process then, once more, the Son is rendered inferior to the Father. So, what conceivable logical basis is there for rejecting Arian's view that the Son is indeed special but certainly isn't God? No rational person could disagree with Arius (who eagerly pointed out that Jesus Christ himself declared: "The Father is greater than I.")

It is Mythos, not Logos, that underlies the treatment of Jesus Christ as God when he plainly never was. He himself never said he was. Only people who are fundamentally intellectually dishonest could ever claim that there is any basis for calling Jesus Christ "God". At the most charitable, within the parameters of Christian theology, he is the Son of God and nothing else. That's the stance that he himself advocated, so why has the Christian Church claimed a higher status for him? The answer is simple. If he is not regarded as God then many Christians wouldn't worship him. Instead, they would worship Jehovah/Allah like the Jews and Muslims. The Christian Church had to lie in order to have any Church at all, and what sort of Church is based on a flagrant and shameless lie?

The Catholic position is that God the Father has no begetter; the Son is from the Father only, and the Holy Spirit is from the Father and Son "equally" (subject to a rather nuanced understanding of this process which isn't in fact equal at all). He is from only one principle, not two i.e. he comes from the Father, through the Son; he does not come half from the father and half from the Son.

Arius declared: "If the Father begat the Son, he that was begotten had a beginning of existence: and from this it is evident that there was a time when the Son was not. It therefore necessarily follows that he had his substance from nothing".

Arius' first assertion that there was a time when God the Son did not exist must be true. But it does not follow that the Son must have come from nothing: the Father could beget the Son from his own substance (through some sort of cloning).

Another way to think of the Trinity is that God the Father is the uncaused originator, the Son is his *Word* (Logos; reason) and the Spirit is his *pneuma* (breath, presence, manifestation). We might say that the Father never intervenes in existence (beyond creating it), the Son carries the Word (reason) into the world and the Spirit brings will and inspiration to the world. None of this changes the fact that the Father is the True God of Christianity and the Son and Spirit are his agents.

God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit are technically defined as "hypostases". Hypostasis means: "That which underlies something else; substance or essence, as distinguished from attributes or qualities." So, the single Godhead of Christianity has three hypostases: the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit. There is one "God substance" (the Godhead) that is expressed by the three hypostases. In the West, hypostases are called "persons", but this may make them too "humanised" and shed some of the intended meaning. In the East, the hypostases might be regarded as activities or energies of God. So, the Father is the source energy, the Son is the rational energy (Nous or Logos), and the Spirit is the Soul energy (Psyche). This brings the Trinity extremely close to the position of Plotinus, the Neoplatonist, who spoke of the *One*, the *Nous* (Mind) and the *Psyche* (Soul).

In Christianity, each hypostasis is uncreated and has the same essence as the other two. However, the specific quality that defines each hypostasis is unique, unshared and cannot be reduced. God the Father is the source energy of the Godhead, hence is the Creator and cause of all things. The Son, like the Platonic Demiurge, is the rational energy that gives form and organisation to Creation. The Spirit is God's soul – his divine breath that permeates the cosmos. However, why a single Christian God would need to have three hypostases is never explained.

Although the Filioque clause helped to bolster the status of Jesus Christ by combating those heretics who maintained that the Son was less than the Father if he did not serve as a source of the Holy Spirit, it invariably downplayed the status of the Holy Spirit in relation to the other two hypostases.

The non-Trinitarian heresy Sabellianism stated that Father, Son and Holy Spirit are not separate persons or hypostases but rather three different modes or aspects of one God. It is the believer who experiences God in these three different modes, not God who actually exists in these three modes.

The *Wikipedia* entry on the Trinity says: "God exists as three persons but is one God, meaning that God the Son and God the Holy Spirit have exactly the same nature or being as God the Father in every way. Whatever attributes and power God the Father has, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit have as well. Thus, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit are also eternal,



omnipresent, omnipotent, infinitely wise, infinitely holy, infinitely loving, omniscient.”

This is what most people understand by the concept of the Trinity, but it so downplays any distinctions between the three persons as to make it impossible to understand why something like Sabellianism (a single God being perceived by humanity in three different ways) isn’t regarded as the Orthodox position.

The three persons are said to coexist in unity as co-equal, co-eternal, consubstantial, and of one being. Yet we have already seen that such a stance cannot be logically sustained at all. The Father begets the Son, so the Father is manifestly more important. The Father is the primary source of the Holy Spirit, so again the Father has primacy. The Holy Spirit is also said to proceed through the Son, hence is lesser than the Son. The Trinity is an absurd concept. It is proclaimed a “mystery of Christian faith”: the usual nonsense that gets spouted when a position is rationally untenable.

You have two choices: place your faith in a manifest piece of lunacy, or use your rational faculties to reject this concept and hence Christianity itself. Tragically, the irrational masses have always chosen to abandon reason rather than faith. Only the illogical, irrational and downright cretinous would advocate faith over reason. What do you have left if you reject reason? You might as well believe in anything at all. What possible limitation will be imposed on you if you choose to disregard logic and reason? If  $2 + 2 = 5$ , you can get rid of mathematics and embrace magic instead. “Magic” is what Abrahamism truly is. It has no connection with science, philosophy, mathematics, reason or logic. If you are a believer, you are saying that magic is more important and truer than reason. That makes you a dangerous lunatic.

What has Abrahamism been if not the history of violent lunacy? As the 9/11 maniacs committed mass murder, they screamed, “God is Greatest,” thus making God, the allegedly morally perfect Creator of the universe, an accomplice in slaughtering innocent men, women and children. That’s what happens when people revere faith and hold reason in contempt. Any mad formula can be applied to God and then believed even unto death. 9/11 would never have happened if Abrahamists were rational and could logically analyse the concept of moral perfection. If it is asserted that moral perfection involves killing innocent children, there’s something catastrophically wrong with “moral perfection” and anyone who practices this type of moral perfection ought to be fought rather than worshipped.

The so-called “Macedonian” heresy was a version of the Arian heresy. It asserted that God the Son was of “similar substance” to God the Father but not of the “same essence”. Moreover, it claimed that the Holy Spirit was a creation of the Son, and the servant of both the Father and the Son. The heretics were known as *pneumatomachians* (the “spirit fighters”) because of their negative attitude to the Holy Spirit.

**“And I believe in one holy catholic and apostolic Church. I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins; and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.”**

Why is one Church so important? Why not many? Why does it need to be apostolic?

How can something as absurd as sprinkling water on people remit their sins? As for the resurrection of the dead, this is a direct challenge to the concept of the immortality of the soul. Souls don’t die – bodies do. Therefore, to make any sense of the concept of resurrection, it must be regarded as implying that souls and bodies are a unity; both die and then both are brought back to life by the power of God. That is, resurrection must logically be defined as a materialistic theory stating that a soul cannot exist without a *specific* physical body: it is tied forever to that body. Hence heaven must be a physical place, and part of the scientific world, or Christianity is false.

Most Christians have no idea what resurrection is and mix and match at will ideas of an immortal soul with a dead body being brought back from the dust.

\*\*\*\*\*

So, we see endless illogicalities, absurdities, contradictions and nonsense in the few short sentences of the Nicene Creed. How stupid would you have to be in the 21st century to mouth these words and take them seriously? They are downright idiotic. They’re not even inspiring. They are empty words uttered by hollow people cut off from the world of reason.

## **The Council of Chalcedon**

THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON in 451 CE provided the following definition of Jesus Christ:

**Therefore, following the holy fathers, we all with one accord teach men to acknowledge one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, at once complete in Godhead and complete in manhood, truly God and truly man, consisting also of a reasonable soul and body; of one substance with the Father as regards his Godhead, and at the same time of one substance with us as regards his manhood; like us in all respects, apart from sin; as regards his Godhead, begotten of the Father before the ages, but yet as regards his manhood begotten, for us men and for our salvation, of Mary the Virgin, the God-bearer; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, recognized in two natures, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation; the distinction of natures being in no way annulled by the union, but rather the characteristics of each nature being preserved and coming together to form one person and subsistence, not as parted or separated into two persons, but one and the same Son and Only-begotten God the Word, Lord Jesus Christ; even as the prophets from earliest times spoke of him, and our Lord Jesus Christ himself taught us, and the creed of the fathers has handed down to us.**

Here we encounter some of the most bizarre propositions ever devised by the human mind:

**“Our Lord Jesus Christ, at once complete in Godhead and complete in manhood, truly God and truly man.”**

This is logically absurd. No human being has ever been “complete in Godhead” so Jesus Christ, as defined, is patently not human. Nor, of course, has any God been “complete in manhood”, so Jesus Christ is patently not God. Jesus Christ is truly *not* God and truly *not* man. What he is, logically, is an incomprehensible and ludicrous hybrid. He is neither human nor God but a freak.

**“...consisting also of a reasonable soul and body...”**

So, does Jesus Christ have the soul of a human being or the soul of God or some hybrid? If he has the soul of a human, he is not God. If he has the soul of God, he is not human. If he has a hybrid soul, he is neither God nor human.

**“...of one substance with the Father as regards his Godhead, and at the same time of one substance with us as regards his manhood...”**

How can anyone simultaneously have two substances, one human and one divine? It's an impossibility. You can have a divine substance or a human substance but you can't have both. If it's possible for a man-God to have two different substances that coexist perfectly then it means that human substance is compatible with God substance. If they were not compatible, Jesus Christ could not have existed. Therefore, the assertion is being made that all human beings are of the same substance as God! (which will come as news to most people).

**“...like us in all respects, apart from sin...”**

In other words, he's not like us at all. How many of us are sinless, and how many of us are God?

**“...as regards his Godhead, begotten of the Father before the ages, but yet as regards his manhood begotten, for us men and for our salvation, of Mary the Virgin, the God-bearer...”**

How can God be begotten by another God? That's a category error. It's pure and utter nonsense. Talking about “before the ages” doesn't make it any less ridiculous. And how can a human virgin give birth to the God who created the universe? It's insane.

**“...one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, recognized in two natures, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation; the distinction of natures being in no way annulled by the union, but rather the characteristics of each nature being preserved and coming together to form one person and subsistence, not as parted or separated into two persons, but one and the same Son and Only-begotten God the Word, Lord Jesus Christ; even as the prophets from earliest times spoke of him, and our Lord Jesus Christ himself taught us, and the creed of the fathers has handed down to us.”**

Without confusion? Only if you're mad. Without change? Yet surely as Jesus Christ grew from baby to man he was changing all the time.

Christianity asserts that Jesus Christ does not just embody God the Son, he *is* God the Son. This means that we must never think of Jesus Christ walking around as a human being possessed by God, so to speak, but instead walking around on earth as GOD. (There is a heresy called adoptionism which states, on the contrary, that God the Son simply adopted a particular human host i.e. the host wasn't God but was possessed by God.) It wasn't a man on the Cross, but God himself. (Strange then that he should cry out: "My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?") This single sentence destroys Christianity. Jesus Christ, out of his own mouth, announced that HE WAS NOT GOD! If we can't believe "God" then who can we believe?)

Chalcedon's definition of Jesus Christ is almost comical in the impossible and absurd assertions it makes.

## **The Constantinople Anathemas**

AT THE SECOND COUNCIL of Constantinople in 553 CE, several Anathemas were pronounced by the Church:

**I. If anyone does not confess that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are one nature or essence, one power or authority, worshipped as a trinity of the same essence, one deity in three hypostases or persons, let him be anathema. For there is one God and Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and one Holy Spirit, in whom are all things.**

So, who would like to philosophically dissect the three phrases: "of whom are all things" (said of God the Father); "through whom are all things" (of God the Son); "in whom are all things" (of God the Holy Spirit)?

All things are OF God the Father i.e. he created everything. But all of his creations were THROUGH Jesus Christ (which seems to make Jesus Christ the true Creator since his "hand" was the one that last touched creation). But all of the creations of the father and Son are IN the Holy Spirit i.e. everything is imbued with the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is everywhere. Technically, this is a statement of pantheism: God and the universe are one and the same thing. This view makes it extremely difficult to account for the existence of evil in which the whole of creation exists IN God. Whence evil if not from God the Holy Spirit since he is everywhere? Is the Holy Spirit actually the Devil? That's what the logic seems to indicate.

**II. If anyone does not confess that God the Word was twice begotten, the first before all time from the Father, non-temporal and bodiless, the other in the last days when he came down from the heavens and was incarnate by the holy, glorious, God-bearer, ever-virgin Mary, and born of her, let him be anathema.**

The pagan god Dionysus was twice begotten. The Christians stole many of the clothes of paganism and gave them a Christian makeover. Note that all Protestants shrink from saying that God was born of the Virgin Mary (hence their refusal to venerate Mary as the Catholics do), thus revealing that they are followers of the "Nestorian heresy" which declared Mary to be the "Christ bearer" but not the "God bearer". That being the case, Protestants are declared anathema by the Second Council of Constantinople, hence are all damned to Hell.

**III. If anyone says that God the Word who performed miracles is one and Christ who suffered is another, or says that God the Word was together with Christ who came from woman, or that the Word was in him as one person is in another, but is not one and the same, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, incarnate and become human, and that the wonders and the suffering which he voluntarily endured in flesh were not of the same person, let him be anathema.**

How can "God" suffer?

**IV. If anyone says that the union of the Word of God with man was only according to grace or function or dignity or equality of honour or authority or relation or effect or power or according to his good pleasure, as though God the Word was pleased with man, or approved of him, as the raving Theodosius says; or that the union exists according to similarity of name, by which the Nestorians call God the Word Jesus and Christ, designating the man**

separately as Christ and as Son, speaking thus clearly of two persons, but when it comes to his honour, dignity, and worship, pretend to say that there is one person, one Son and one Christ, by a single designation; and if he does not acknowledge, as the holy Fathers have taught, that the union of God is made with the flesh animated by a reasonable and intelligent soul, and that such union is according to synthesis or hypostasis, and that therefore there is only one person, the Lord Jesus Christ one of the holy Trinity -- let him be anathema. As the word "union" has many meanings, the followers of the impiety of Apollinaris and Eutyches, assuming the disappearance of the natures, affirm a union by confusion. On the other hand the followers of Theodore and of Nestorius rejoicing in the division of the natures, introduce only a union of relation. But the holy Church of God, rejecting equally the impiety of both heresies, recognizes the union of God the Word with the flesh according to synthesis, that is according to hypostasis. For in the mystery of Christ the union according to synthesis preserves the two natures which have combined without confusion and without separation.

So let's examine the concept of having two natures -- one human and one divine in a single person. That seems to mean that Christ has both a human mind and a divine mind, a human soul and a divine soul, a human body and a divine body, a human will and a divine will, human desires and divine desires. How is such a synthesis possible? It's the worst ever case of dualism. How can two incompatible substances interact? How can a divine nature and human nature coexist unless the two natures are actually the same?! What does it mean for a God soul and human soul to coexist in one person?

**V. If anyone understands the expression -- one hypostasis of our Lord Jesus Christ -- so that it means the union of many hypostases, and if he attempts thus to introduce into the mystery of Christ two hypostases, or two persons, and, after having introduced two persons, speaks of one person according to dignity, honour or worship, as Theodore and Nestorius insanely have written; and if anyone slanders the holy synod of Chalcedon, as though it had used this expression in this impious sense, and does not confess that the Word of God is united with the flesh hypostatically, and that therefore there is but one hypostasis or one person, and that the holy synod of Chalcedon has professed in this sense the one hypostasis of our Lord Jesus Christ; let him be anathema. For the Holy Trinity, when God the Word was incarnate, was not increased by the addition of a person or hypostasis.**

If God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit all have separate natures (as they must do if they are separate persons) then it logically follows that if the person of God the Son consisted of two natures (divine and human) in Jesus Christ, the Trinity therefore acquired a FOURTH nature -- human nature! So, the Trinity was indeed increased, not by a person or hypostasis, but by a nature: a human nature. So now the Godhead is part human -- which means either that human nature is capable of being elevated to divinity or the Godhead can be degraded and reduced in perfection. So which is it? Either Jesus Christ's humanity corrupted the Godhead, or the proof has been provided that all humans are capable of becoming God!

**VI. If anyone says that the holy, glorious, and ever-virgin Mary is called God-bearer by misuse of language and not truly, or by analogy, believing that only a mere man was born of her and that God the Word was not incarnate of her, but that the incarnation of God the Word resulted only from the fact that he united himself to that man who was born of her; if anyone slanders the Holy Synod of Chalcedon as though it had asserted the Virgin to be God-bearer according to the impious sense of Theodore; or if anyone shall call her manbearer or Christbearer, as if Christ were not God, and shall not confess that she is truly God-bearer, because God the Word who before all time was begotten of the Father was in these last days incarnate of her, and if anyone shall not confess that in this pious sense the holy Synod of Chalcedon confessed her to be God-bearer: let him be anathema.**

The Gospels clearly state that Jesus Christ had brothers and sisters, so Mary clearly wasn't any kind of perpetual virgin. It seems rather squalid for the Mother of God to be regularly fucking Joseph, doesn't it? Couldn't she have shown some divine reserve and decorum? Then again, we know that Mary loved sex...which is why she allowed herself to be impregnated by the Archon Gabriel while she was betrothed to poor old cuckold Joseph.

**VII. If anyone using the expression, "in two natures," does not confess that our one Lord Jesus Christ is made known in the deity and in the manhood, in order to indicate by that**

**expression a difference of the natures of which the ineffable union took place without confusion, a union in which neither the nature of the Word has changed into that of the flesh, nor that of the flesh into that of the Word (for each remained what it was by nature, even when the union by hypostasis had taken place); but shall take the expression with regard to the mystery of Christ in a sense so as to divide the parties, let him be anathema. Or if anyone recognizing the number of natures in the same our one Lord Jesus Christ, God the Word incarnate, does not take in contemplation only the difference of the natures which compose him, which difference is not destroyed by the union between them -- for one is composed of the two and the two are in one -- but shall make use of the number two to divide the natures or to make of them persons properly so called, let him be anathema.**

“A union in which neither the nature of the Word has changed into that of the flesh, nor that of the flesh into that of the Word (for each remained what it was by nature, even when the union by hypostasis had taken place).” This indicates that Jesus’ human nature WASN’T DIVINE; in which case Jesus Christ wasn’t God because he had a non-God nature as well as a God nature. God can’t be God unless he is fully God. Just as a woman can’t be part-virgin or part-pregnant, nor can God be part-God. He’s either God or he’s not. If he has a human nature as part of his total nature then he is not God since human nature is not, so we are told, the nature of God.

**VIII. If anyone confesses that the union took place out of two natures or speaks of the one incarnate nature of God the Word and does not understand those expressions as the holy Fathers have taught, that out of the divine and human natures, when union by hypostasis took place, one Christ was formed; but from these expressions tries to introduce one nature or essence of the Godhead and manhood of Christ; let him be anathema. For in saying that the only-begotten Word was united by hypostasis personally we do not mean that there was a mutual confusion of natures, but rather we understand that the Word was united to the flesh, each nature remaining what it was. Therefore there is one Christ, God and man, of the same essence with the Father as touching his Godhead, and of the same essence with us as touching his manhood. Therefore the Church of God equally rejects and anathematizes those who divide or cut apart or who introduce confusion into the mystery of the divine dispensation of Christ.**

What is being suggested here is that Jesus Christ is a “spectrum” being. At one end of the spectrum he touches the Godhead, and at the other end he touches humanity. Of course, that logically means he’s neither God nor human but some freakish hybrid.

**IX. If anyone says that Christ ought to be worshipped in his two natures, in the sense that he introduces two adorations, the one peculiar to God the Word and the other peculiar to the man; or if anyone by destroying the flesh, or by confusing the Godhead and the humanity, or by contriving one nature or essence of those which were united and so worships Christ, and does not with one adoration worship God the Word incarnate with his own flesh, as the Church of God has received from the beginning; let him be anathema.**

Well, should the non-God part of Jesus Christ be worshipped if it’s human and not divine? Isn’t it blasphemy to worship a human? Aren’t we warned against worshipping false Gods?

**X. If anyone does not confess that our Lord Jesus Christ who was crucified in the flesh is true God and the Lord of Glory and one of the Holy Trinity; let him be anathema.**

Obviously he’s not true God since it has been stated that he has a human nature as well as a divine nature, and therefore he is not of the full nature of God. The people who formulated this anathema should be declared anathema!

**XI. If anyone does not anathematize Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinaris, Nestorius, Eutyches and Origen, together with their impious, godless writings, and all the other heretics already condemned and anathematized by the holy catholic and apostolic Church, and by the aforementioned four Holy Synods and all those who have held and hold or who in their godlessness persist in holding to the end the same opinion as those heretics just mentioned; let him be anathema.**

Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinaris, Nestorius, Eutyches and Origen were all great men, and much more logical and rational than the “believers” who won the day. All of the Christian

heresies made much more sense than the orthodox position. Christianity's final definition of Jesus Christ is simply preposterous. Can anyone truly make any sense of (or take seriously) the contention that the God of the entire Cosmos walked around in the Roman province of Judea 2,000 years ago as one person (who looked very much like an ordinary human being) with TWO NATURES AND TWO SUBSTANCES, divine and human? It's impossible to understand. None of the highly intelligent heretics understood it. Could any average Christian ever explain the nature of Christ without falling into one or more heresies? Most Christians have no idea what they believe. It's scarcely surprising given the degree of bafflement involved.

In order to ward off the attacks that were coming in from all angles, the advocates of the orthodox position chose to dispense with any attempt at logic and created a "mystery of faith" – which is the same as saying they don't know what they're talking about.

Why aren't all of these matters continually discussed in Christian schools and churches? How come virtually no Christian has ever heard of the heretics who challenged Christianity? Just as Stalin erased his enemies from history, so did the Christian Church. It was as if they never existed. Only experts ever find out about the heretics. The ordinary people are never exposed to their arguments. Why not? Well, if they ever heard what the heretics had to say, they themselves would likely fall victim to one or other of the many heresies.

Look at what happened with Protestantism. Once the Protestant heresy had reared its head, endless Protestant sects sprung up. If all the heresies of the ancient Christians were known, the Christian Church would collapse overnight (which is why we're so eager to shine the spotlight on the Christian heretics).

## **The Apostles' Creed**

HERE IS THE so-called Apostles' Creed:

**I believe in God, the Father Almighty, the Maker of heaven and earth, and in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord: Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried; He descended into hell. The third day He arose again from the dead; He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.**

**I believe in the Holy Ghost; the holy Catholic Church; the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body; and the life everlasting.**

**Amen.**

What does this tell us?

- 1) God the Father (not the Son!) made heaven and earth. (Where did the Trinity live prior to the creation of heaven?)
- 2) Jesus Christ – God the Son – was conceived by the Holy Ghost. Yet earlier we saw that the Holy Ghost "proceeded" from the Father and the Son. So, the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Son and yet the Holy Ghost conceived the Son. This is all becoming horrendously circular, isn't it?
- 3) Jesus Christ descended into Hell. But why would he? Why would there be any need for God to visit hell for three days? The accusation has been levelled that yet another Biblical mistranslation has occurred. Just as Mary was referred to as an "unmarried woman" and this was taken to mean that she was a virgin – although there is of course no necessary connection between being unmarried and being a virgin – so the Jewish word "Sheol" was wrongly translated as "Hell". A myth was then created thanks to Christian ignorance regarding what Sheol meant (it actually refers to a gloomy place of the dead; a single or mass grave). A lot of Christianity is based on such sand-like foundations. Indeed pretty much the whole thing. The fact that Jesus Christ was in Sheol for three days simply meant that he was in the grave for three days. It had nothing to do with Hell. The astonishing thing is that Christianity manufactured a fascinating story – the "harrowing of Hell" where Christ visits

Hell – based on a translation error.

Christianity is pure Mythos. Its purpose is to generate stories that grip people's imaginations. The self-evident truth that the whole thing is proven nonsense is ignored. Rather than admit that a betrothed girl was seduced and impregnated by a manipulative stranger (the Archon Gabriel), Christianity declared that a virgin gave birth to God! Has there ever been a more lunatic claim? And to think that this is the most successful religion in history.

## **The Athanasian Creed**

THREE CREEDS ARE ACCEPTED by the Catholic and Anglican churches: the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed and the Athanasian Creed. The first reflects the doctrines taught by the Apostles and the last reflects the opinions of the main champion of orthodoxy – Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria.

Here is the Creed named after him:

**Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the catholic faith; Which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.**

Note the classic tactic of extremist religion: damn anyone to destruction who rejects the faith. Promise that all believers will be saved.

**And the Catholic faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity; neither confounding the persons, nor dividing the substance for there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son and another of the Holy Spirit. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit is all one, the glory equal, the majesty co-eternal. Such as the Father is, such is the Son and such is the Holy Spirit. The Father uncreated, the Son uncreated, and the Holy Spirit uncreated. The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible, and the Holy Spirit incomprehensible.**

You can say that again! Who wants to believe in three incomprehensible Gods who are also one incomprehensible God?

**The Father eternal, the Son eternal, and the Holy Spirit eternal.**

Yet the Father must have preceded the Son, and Father and Son must have preceded the Holy Spirit, so they're certainly not eternal in the strict meaning of the word.

**And yet they are not three eternals, but one eternal.**

What?

**As also there are not three uncreated nor three incomprehensibles, but one uncreated and one incomprehensible.**

What?

**So likewise the Father is almighty, the Son almighty, and the Holy Spirit almighty; And yet they are not three almighties, but one almighty.**

What?

**So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God; And yet they are not three Gods, but one God.**

What?

**So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, and the Holy Spirit Lord; And yet they are not three Lords, but one Lord.**

What?

**For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity to acknowledge every person by himself**

**to be God and Lord; so are we forbidden by the catholic religion to say: There are three Gods or three Lords.**

Yet you seem to keep saying it.

**The Father is made of none, neither created nor begotten. The Son is of the Father alone; not made nor created, but begotten.**

That makes the Father and Son *radically* different. And what *exactly* is the difference between being made, created or begotten – what is the process involved in each case? What does begetting consist of scientifically?

**The Holy Spirit is of the Father and of the Son; neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.**

So, define the difference between begetting and proceeding? What exactly is proceeding? What are the mechanics of it, the science?

**So there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Spirit, not three Holy Spirits.**

That sounds like three Gods.

**And in this Trinity none is afore, nor after another; none is greater, or less than another.**

Well, the Father was “afore” the Son and Holy Spirit. Unlike the Son, he wasn’t begotten. Unlike the Holy Spirit, he didn’t proceed from anyone. Doesn’t that make the Father greater and the Holy Spirit the least? These Christians just keep playing ridiculous verbal games. They show the ways in which the three Gods are unequal and then declare them equal. They keep doing it. They show that black and white are different and then declare them the same and expect to be taken seriously.

**But the whole three persons are co-eternal, and co-equal.**

No, they’re not, and no matter how many times you say it, you’re not going to make it any more credible.

**So that in all things, as aforesaid, the Unity in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped. He therefore that will be saved must thus think of the Trinity.**

In the madhouse, no doubt.

**Furthermore it is necessary to everlasting salvation that he also believe rightly the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.**

If the Trinity wasn’t bad enough, now we have the even more ridiculous Incarnation. And Hell mend you if you believe wrongly!

**For the right faith is that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man.**

How can someone be both? It’s impossible. The two concepts are mutually exclusive.

**God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds; and made of the substance of His mother, born in the world.**

So Jesus Christ is half God substance and half human substance. In other words, he’s half a man and half a God...a bit like the monstrous Minotaur stalking the Labyrinth: half man and half bull.)

**Perfect God and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting.**

He’s neither perfect God nor perfect man. He’s a screwed-up version of both.

**Equal to the Father as touching His Godhead, and inferior to the Father as touching His**



**manhood.**

So he's inferior to God the Father. Now we have it in writing.

**Who, although He is God and man, yet He is not two, but one Christ.**

And Christ is plainly neither God nor man but some weird hybrid: a mutant.

**One, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the manhood into God. One altogether, not by the confusion of substance, but by unity of person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ; Who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead; He ascended into heaven, He sitteth on the right hand of the Father, God Almighty; From thence He shall come to judge the living and the dead. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies;**

What do they need their bodies for?

**And shall give account of their own works. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.**

That's right: issue the usual threats of your Torture God, your God of Terror. What sick mind resurrects people simply to send them to Hell? Why not just leave them alone in oblivion?

**This is the catholic faith, which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved.**

He can't be saved if he *does* believe it!

## Origen

ONE OF THE GREATEST Christian theologians was Origen, most famous for his teachings on the pre-existence of the soul, a stance that made him an advocate of reincarnation, though many horrified Christians futilely claim that he never openly endorsed reincarnation.

No one who has actually read Origen could be in any doubt that he was a Christian reincarnationist. If a soul can pre-exist a body, it can also survive the death of a body, hence is not linked to any particular body, which automatically implies reincarnation over resurrection.

Just as Christianity would have been an enormously better religion if Pelagius (the opponent of Original Sin and champion of man's ability to effect his own salvation) had triumphed over St Augustine (advocate of Original Sin and the necessity of divine grace for human beings to be saved), so it would have been radically better if Origen's theology had triumphed over that of his many bitter enemies.

Had Christianity been reincarnationist rather than resurrectionist, like Hinduism and Buddhism, East and West would have had a much closer relationship, Judaism would have been marginalised and faded into oblivion, and Islam would never have come into being in the first place. The defeat of Origen's theology represents one of the greatest catastrophes in human history. Given a slightly different set of circumstances, the West would have become "Origenal" and reincarnationist. The vile Jewish lie of resurrection would have been dead and buried forever.

Another of Origen's radical ideas was the logical one that the Son of God cannot be God in the same sense as his Father. He declared that the Son was "God" while the Father was "*the* God", and he later explicitly described the Son as "a secondary God" (*deúteros theós*) in contrast with the Father as "the first God" (*autotheós*), thus subordinating the Son to the Father. He maintained that the Son was "of a different essence, begotten out of the will of the Father." By making the Son inferior to the Father, Origen was displaying a much more logical stance than usually found in Christian theologians.

The first chapter of the Gospel of John says: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The Word was with God at the beginning, and through him all things came to be; no single thing was created without him. All that came to be was alive with his life and that life was the light of men."

In his Commentary on John, Origen wrote: "Thus, if all things were made, as in this passage also *through* the Logos ['the Word'], then they were not made by the Logos, but by a stronger and greater than He. And who else could this be but the Father?"

Members of the Illuminati have been working on a project to create a new, sane version of

Christianity based on the thinking of Pelagius and Origen. This new version involves knowledge (*gnosis*), good deeds, reincarnation and apotheosis. It dispenses with virgin birth, resurrection, original sin, grace, faith and the Messiah.

In this new Illuminist version of Christianity, John's words are interpreted in the following way: God was originally an unconscious being and gradually evolved consciousness. This new consciousness of God was called the Word – the Logos – the so-called Son of God. In other words, God the Father and God the Son had the same substance but the Son was differentiated from the Father by virtue of being conscious, rational and logical rather than unconscious and instinctual, driven by will alone.

God the Father was the unconscious Freudian Id, so to speak, whereas God the Son was the conscious Superego. The Jewish Bible is the tale of the Id running riot. The New Testament is about the reasonable, moral, conscious Son of God, no longer driven by will, but by reason and morality: hence the radically different tone of the Old and New Testaments. The Old is about God as pure Will – the unconscious, tyrannical Id (“Obey Me or Perish”) – and the New is about God as rational and moral (“Do as you would be done by; Love your neighbour as yourself; forgive your enemies; turn the other cheek.”). God the Holy Spirit is generated by the God-unconscious (God the Father), processed by God-consciousness (God the Son) and interacts dialectically with the world, rising higher and higher until he becomes Omega-God (God's Highest Self, his most perfect Self, his maximum actualisation) i.e. God the Holy Spirit is the Hegelian Absolute Geist.

God the Son's incarnation in Jesus Christ was in the nature of a divine possession of an ordinary person in order to show him – and the rest of humanity – how to become God.

In this way, Christianity can be transformed from a stupid religion of faith into a sophisticated, rational, evolutionary religion, similar to Illuminism.

In this version of Christianity, there are not three persons in one God. Rather there are three layers of God's mind: unconscious, conscious and super-conscious (omega-conscious). At a stroke, the concept of the Trinity is made rational. It also means that all human beings are truly made in God's image. Like him, we have an unconscious mind and a conscious mind, and the point of God the Son's incarnation on earth was to show us how to become super-conscious (i.e. Gods ourselves). After his crucifixion and “death”, God the Son did not return to the earth; it was God the Holy Spirit who appeared after Christ's death i.e. the transfigured, deified higher Christ. The event known as the Transfiguration was a foreshadowing of this miraculous transformation.

Which version of Christianity do you prefer? – that of “old” Christianity or the rational, new Illuminist version which is about giving everyone the chance to be Christ and become God.

Returning to Origen, he recognised that if God the Son was begotten in time then he would be like all the rest of God's creatures, hence could not logically be described as “only begotten Son”. So, he said that the Son was begotten “in eternity”. The point of this manoeuvre was to remove God the Son from temporal considerations and make him eternal, hence unlike any of God's temporal creatures. Orthodox Christianity eagerly seized on this ingenious formulation to place God the Son on the same eternal footing as God the Father (and the same consideration was then applied to God the Holy Spirit).

However, it's a fake escape from a logical impasse. Even if God the Son is removed from ordinary time, nothing changes the fact that he is begotten and not the begetter. The introduction of eternity does not alter the priority of the begetter over the begotten. The Father still came before the Son, so the Son must be subordinate to his Father, hence he must be a lesser God. Origen fully accepted this; orthodox Christianity declared it heretical.

God the Son can be given equal status to God the Father only if he actually *is* God the Father, but with some radical new attribute (such as consciousness), and God the Holy Spirit can proceed from the Father through the Son only if he is once again God the Father but with an even higher mode of consciousness (super-consciousness). There is only one God, but there are three levels of consciousness, reflecting three different God personas (just as Freud confers three minds on individual human beings: the id mind, ego mind and superego mind).

Origen wrote; “We consider, therefore, that there are three hypostases, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit; and at the same time we believe nothing to be uncreated but the Father. We therefore, as the more pious and the truer course, admit that all things were made by the Logos, and that the Holy Spirit is the most excellent and the first in order of all that was made by the Father through Christ.”

By making the Son subordinate to the Father and the Holy Spirit subordinate to the Son, Origen's thinking was clearly a strong influence on the likes of the heretical *Pneumatomachians*.

## The Creeds

THE CHRISTIAN CREEDS are almost entirely concerned with defending the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation. They don't say anything meaningful about the nature of the soul, resurrection, and heaven.

The Trinity doctrine is the absurd position that there are three "persons" in One God; a lunatic attempt to combine triadic polytheism with monotheism, and failing spectacularly. The Islamic statement that there is no God but God is, in essence, designed to stand as the total refutation of the Trinity. In Islam, Jesus Christ is a prophet special to God, but certainly not God, and the functions of the Holy Spirit are carried out by angels, particularly the Angel Gabriel. In monotheistic terms, this is enormously more credible than Christianity. No weird and wonderful arguments have to be advanced by Muslims to defend the nature of their God. They don't have to explain how God could walk around Judea as a man who then got himself crucified. Frankly, it's sometimes hard not to laugh out loud when considering the propositions of Christianity. How can anyone take them seriously?

The Christian creeds contain no mathematics, no science and no philosophy. They are all about dubious theological assertions designed to refute innumerable Christian heretics. Christianity has always championed the position that faith and revelation should trump reason. So, if revelation declares X to be the case, and reason declares X to be impossible, X is nevertheless accepted as true and declared a matter of faith. All the heresies were rational challenges to faith positions, and rationality ALWAYS LOST.

Origen was often regarded as the first and greatest Christian theologian, yet he himself was anathematised. Why? For, amongst other things, pointing out that the Son owes his existence to the Father; the Father does not owe his existence to the Son. How could any sane person conclude that the Father and Son were therefore absolutely equivalent? Origen knew they couldn't be; orthodoxy declared: "YES THEY ARE, AND ANYONE WHO SAYS OTHERWISE IS A HERETIC." The orthodox didn't present any rational arguments; they simply shouted more loudly and demanded that faith trump reason.

Let's be clear. You cannot have three different person-Gods in One God. You can have one God, or three separate Gods. You can't have both. It makes no difference if you refer to "persons" rather than Gods. There's absolutely no difference. You can't combine monotheism and polytheism. Nor can monotheism be combined with an Incarnation. You can't have the one God of the Cosmos entering into a human life and ending up crucified on a Roman Cross.

In Christianity, the Incarnation is possible only because of the Trinity: the two concepts are indissolubly linked. God the Son can become Jesus Christ only because God the Father and the Holy Spirit are still available to carry on the functions of God. A truly monotheistic God cannot die on a cross because it would mean that God had ceased to exist. If you reject the Trinity, you must reject the Incarnation. In Judaism and Islam, it's impossible for God to become Incarnate. God might choose a Messiah to execute his will, but he himself could never personally be the Messiah.

Christians are in a position of double jeopardy. They are committed to defending not just one logical absurdity but two. The two stand together. The only point of the Trinity is to allow the man Jesus Christ to be treated as God, and only because the Trinity "exists" is it possible for one person of the Trinity to become incarnate on earth. No Trinity, no Incarnation. No Incarnation, no Trinity.

Moreover, how does the Incarnation fit with the Trinity? Is the human nature of Jesus Christ now part of the Trinity? If not, where did it go? What happened to it? Is God now partly human? Doesn't that make him somewhat flawed and less than perfect? Or, can human nature meld perfectly with divine nature? Is the real message of Christianity that every human has "God potential" and can become God?! Christ was merely the first, the one who showed everyone the way. We can all be Christ. But that's heresy, surely. Well, is it?

## **The Missing Soul of Christianity**

ISN'T THE LACK OF Christian commentary on the soul simply staggering? There's no discussion of whether the soul is material or immaterial in the Christian creeds. There is no mention of what happens to the soul when the body dies. Where does it go? What is it? There is no explanation of why resurrection is necessary. There is no discussion of heaven.

It has to be borne in mind that the Nicene Creed was written some seven hundred years after Plato. We encourage everyone to read Plato's *Republic*, immediately followed by the Bible. In the former case, you realise you are in the presence of one of humanity's greatest geniuses. In the latter, it's as if you're reading gibberish produced by an illiterate ape. You couldn't get a

greater contrast between Logos and Mythos. Plato intellectually defends all of his positions. He gives a brilliant and vivid account of the nature of the immaterial soul. He distinguishes between the changing, flawed, deficient material world and the immutable, eternal, immaterial domain of Perfect Forms. There is no reliance on divine revelation in Plato. There is no appeal to faith. Everything is rationally set out. Everyone can see what they're getting for their money.

Why is Christianity as unsuccessful in rationally presenting its position as Plato is successful? One might have thought that the human race would produce something even more dazzling than Plato's brilliant philosophy seven hundred years after it was written. Isn't that what progress is all about? Yet, with Christianity, it was as if the human mind had *regressed* seven hundred years in relation to Plato. It was as if reason had died and been replaced by ancient superstitions and primitive beliefs. That was the Jewish effect, of course.

Judaeo-Christianity unquestionably represents an all-out attack on reason. Christianity is regressive. Whereas Plato laid many of the foundations of the modern enlightened world, Christianity wanted to take us back to the primordial slime. It has always been a force of anti-enlightenment. It is for stupid, irrational people who can't cope with complex ideas. It's for childish people who want childish beliefs to cling to for comfort. When you call yourself a Christian you are announcing to the world that you have a low IQ.

When religious texts are laid side by side with philosophy, it's as if two separate species are being catered for. The religious texts are offensively stupid. One can only be amazed by the sheer scale of the idiocy exemplified by the Torah, Bible and Koran, yet these are supposed to be the "Word of God". If they are then God is no philosopher, no scientist, and isn't even in possession of any rational faculties. He is purely concerned with emotion and threats. He is the Mythos God who turned his back forever on Logos.

Hegel observed that religion was essentially a means for the poorly educated to acquire some grasp of the truth. The complex ideas of philosophy were beyond them, so they had only two other potential routes of contact with the divine: childish religions or art. Most people are as alienated from art as they are from philosophy, so religion is their sole life raft.

There will come a time in the future when religion in its current form – i.e. as texts for stupid people – will no longer exist. It will be replaced by philosophy, science, mathematics and psychology, and the world will be infinitely better off.

Nothing better illustrates the absurdity of religion than the Filioque dispute that we have already mentioned, concerning the "Procession of the Holy Spirit". This controversy endures to this day as a wedge between Western and Eastern Christianity.

The West took the stance that if the Son is one with the Father then it follows that anything that proceeds from the Father must also proceed from the Son. The West was determined to emphasize the unity of the Father and the Son. However, the East saw the Filioque as an attack on the Holy Spirit, making him subordinate to Father and Son.

The Filioque is, logically, the equation:

**(God the Father = God the Son) > God the Holy Spirit.**

The Eastern Orthodox position is, logically:

**God the Father > (God the Son = God the Holy Spirit).**

In neither case is there any logical possibility of an equal Trinity. All Christians, if they were being honest, would acknowledge that God the Father is the True God in their scheme. He begets God the Son, and the Holy Spirit originates from him, so self-evidently, neither is his equal. They are dependent on him for their existence. If he had decided not to beget the Son nor originate the Spirit then neither would exist, but he still would. Therefore HE is God and there can be no rational argument or debate about it. The Trinity is a sham. What it actually amounts to is that God created two sub-Gods to assist him. That's the only logical way to interpret the doctrine. The two sub-Gods are NOT God. They are his first and finest creations, made from his own substance.

The Trinity doctrine wants to assert that:

**God the Father = God the Son = God the Holy Spirit.**

This is impossible if the Son and Holy Spirit owe their existence to the Father but he doesn't owe his existence to them. It's really that simple.

Saint Maximus wrote, "...the Father is the only cause of the Son and the Spirit, the one by begetting and the other by procession."

So, what exactly do "begetting" and "procession" mean in relation to the Trinity? As

expected, Christianity makes no attempt to provide an explanation. So we will attempt to examine some of the possibilities.

Both words can be said to mean “causing the existence of”. If God the Father “begets” God the Son, it would be rather awkward to say that God the Father also begets God the Holy Spirit because that would make the Holy Spirit “Son of God” too. How would the two Sons be distinguished? No, that’s no good. “Procession” is exactly the same as begetting but a different word had to be conjured to differentiate between the Son and Holy Spirit.

What is “begetting”? We know that the Son and the Holy Spirit are of one substance with the Father, so it can only be imagined that the Father separates his own substance into three parts. We might say that he creates two clones of himself, each of which then develops its own persona, but is fully consistent with all the perfect attributes of the perfect substance of the divine. The trouble is if God the Father was once the sum and substance of God and then gave away two thirds of his substance to the Son and Holy Spirit, he, personally, is a lesser God than he used to be. But isn’t it impossible for God to grow *less*, to decline, for his powers to wane? In a sense, we have to say that the “Old” God died and was replaced by three brand new Gods called Father, Son and Holy Spirit. God the Father wasn’t the continuation of the original Godhead, but was a new God that came into being at the same time as God the Son and with exactly equal status. So, God the Father didn’t beget the Son at all. Rather, the “Old” God sacrificed himself to make two new Gods (named Father and Son, although these were actually nonsensical titles by this stage). Similarly, these two Gods then sacrificed themselves to create three new, equal Gods.

It’s obvious why the Filioque clause was so controversial. To say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father *and* Son means that one of God’s clones is then involved in a secondary cloning process – which would be heresy since it makes the Holy Spirit the clone of a clone. However, if the Son is *not* involved in the procession of the Spirit, it means that the Holy Spirit is now less than the Son because whereas the Son was a clone of the full God, the spirit would only be a clone of the part of the God substance not belonging to the Son.

Let’s analyse the divine arithmetic of cloning. If God the Father is originally 100% God substance and gives up half of his substance to the Son then God the Father and God the Son now each have 50% God substance. So, if God the Father alone gives rise to the Holy Spirit (dividing his 50% into two 25% portions) then Father and Son will now have less God substance than the Son (each will be 25% God in contrast with the Son’s 50%), hence be less Godly. Therefore that can’t be right. God the Father must in fact give up a third of his God Substance, and so must God the Son. Each God thus has a third of the God Substance. But now we return to the problem of cloning a clone. Whatever way you slice it, the Filioque dispute cannot be happily resolved, hence the Trinity concept is dashed to death on the rocks of hard logic.

The Trinity debate makes no mention at all of the rather crucial issue of whether God is material or immaterial. Cloning a material substance is one thing, but how do you clone an immaterial, mental substance? That becomes equivalent to Multiple Personality Disorder, also known as Dissociative Identity Disorder...which makes the Christian “God” a lunatic! (which would certainly explain a great deal).

It’s a shame that Christian theologians didn’t spend as much time on the science of God as the theology of God. In fact, they didn’t consider the science or mathematics of God at all.

As we keep saying, Christianity is driven by Mythos logic, not Logos logic. Here is the Trinity Mythos: 1) God the Father is the mysterious transcendent SOURCE of all things, who creates everything but doesn’t then personally involve himself in Creation. This serves the Mythos function of allowing God to be regarded as infinitely mysterious. 2) God the Son serves the Mythos function of the Messiah, the God who incarnates himself in order to sacrifice himself for humanity then comes back from the dead to kill all of the enemies of God, at which point he reigns over a paradise for the righteous. 3) But only one Incarnation is plausible – he can’t keep coming back or he would seem incompetent. So, another God is required to act as the divine presence in the absence of the mysterious Father and the Messiah Son. Voila the Holy Spirit. He is available at all times to execute God’s will. He can descend on the Apostles. He can swoop down on Pentecostal Churches and make people speak in tongues and have fits.

Do you see how brilliantly the Mythos is put together? It’s a work of art. The only problem is that in relation to the Logos – the Truth – it’s bullshit from beginning to end and makes no sense at all. But the vast majority of humans are Mythos not Logos people, so they don’t see any of the problems that the Logos people see. That’s why Mythos people are believers and most Logos people are atheists, skeptics and agnostics. What you’re actually witnessing is different types of human thinking. Atheists can’t believe in Mythos religions because these religions are logically absurd. Mythos people can believe in them because the Mythos “logic” of story-telling makes perfect sense to them and they’re too ignorant of Logos thinking to see any of the gaping flaws in

logic.

Mythos people cannot subscribe to a Logos religion such as Illuminism because they're literally too stupid. They don't understand mathematics, philosophy and science, hence can't grasp the Truth.

Let's just stress that point. Mythos religions have no connection with the truth. Mythos is about emotions and story logic, not about abstract reason and logic. Only Logos is concerned with the truth. Therefore the human race, overwhelmingly Mythos rather than Logos oriented, is labouring under the most enormous delusions and illusions, and has almost zero relationship with the truth. Only mathematicians, scientists, and philosophers have kept the flame of truth burning – and most people hate mathematics, science and philosophy.

What a world!

## **Truth Genes?**

THE VAST MAJORITY OF truth seekers in world history have been men. The condition of autism (which is an overwhelmingly male condition) is sometimes referred to as an example of the "extreme male brain". We would contest that view. In terms of Paul McLean's hypothesis of the triune brain, the primitive Reptilian brain might be said to be archetypally male, while the more sophisticated limbic system, the centre of the emotions, is archetypally female, and the neocortex is the "truth brain" (which is the least animal, most rational and logical, most computer-like part of the brain; it is also the youngest part of the human brain). Autistics are actually suffering from extreme "truth brain" – they have almost no emotional life or interest in other people. Some of them have prodigious calculating abilities and almost perfect memories. They are "neocortex" beings with deficient limbic systems.

Women, as the emotional experts, struggle to escape from Mythos to Logos. Emotions keep drawing them back. Autistics have strayed too far from the emotional circuits of the brain and become machine-like. The greatest geniuses of the human race have typically been men with a good balance between the neocortex and the limbic system. They are not overly interested in emotions, but nor have they completely detached themselves emotionally. All geniuses are in effect not only one step from madness but also from autism. Many geniuses have been considered to have the highest-functioning form of Autism – Asperger's Syndrome. Through a careful study of Asperger's Syndrome, it may be possible to identify "Genius genes" or, we might call them "Logos genes" or even "Truth genes".

One day, it might be possible to genetically engineer a human population of geniuses of both sexes. Getting the balance right between Mythos and Logos is imperative. It would be disastrous to kill off Mythos, or to radically curtail human emotions.

At the moment, humanity is far too Mythos-centric and we need to make it more Logos-centric, but we mustn't go too far down the Logos line. We want to create an optimised humanity with expert female emotional handling allied with the genius abilities of the neocortex. We want Einsteins with the emotional sensitivities and interpersonal rapport of Oprah Winfrey!

Imagine the whole human race being articulate both emotionally and rationally, a perfect blend of Mythos and Logos. Would we not have created a paradise of gods and goddesses?

Religion staggers on as a manifestation of the lower parts of the brain – the crocodile brain and the emotional brain. That's why it's linked with emotional incontinence, with violent fanaticism and extremism, with irrationality and superstition. Religion has no connection with the neocortex and until it does it will remain a force for complete evil in our world. Mainstream religion is Satanic because it is irrational and therefore the perfect territory for an evil, manipulative Devil. All mainstream "Gods" are irredeemably evil. Human beings have never been anything other than Devil worshippers.

It is reason that distinguishes us from animals and yet it is reason that religion condemns as the "Devil's whore" – in other words, religion is animalistic, primitive and hostile to humanity maximising its intelligence. Why should that be? Because the last thing evil priests, prophets and popes want is a smart, autonomous humanity that they can't frighten, intimidate and control.

## **The Son of the Son of God?**

ACCORDING TO TRINITY THEORY, God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit all have one third of the God substance and differ only in having distinctive personas. Each persona is perfect in its own way and reflects the inherent perfection of the God substance. A Christian might even argue that it was necessary for God the Father to bring the Son and Holy Spirit into existence to make himself more perfect still: the whole being greater than the sum of its parts.

So, who impregnated the “virgin” Mary and became the father of Jesus Christ, Son of God? Well, there are of course three candidates. God the Father is certainly qualified given his name, but we know that he doesn’t interact with his Creation. God the Holy Spirit was said to have done the honours, but there was in fact no logical obstacle to God the Son himself impregnating Mary and thus being his own father!!!

The concept of God the Son being the father of the Son of God (Jesus Christ) no doubt sounded perverse to the Christian mind, so they rejected that idea. Unfortunately for them, they also logically destroyed Christianity. How can the substance of God the Holy Spirit be the father of the divine component of the Son of God, Jesus Christ? If the Holy Spirit impregnated Mary then the divine substance of Jesus Christ can’t have belonged to anyone other than the Holy Spirit, and certainly not to God the Son. So Jesus Christ therefore does not conform with the desired divine equation: “Son of God” = “God the Son”. He is unquestionably the son of *God the Holy Spirit* and has no direct connection with either God the Son or God the Father, except by virtue of the abstract unity offered by the Trinity.

Have we not delivered a fatal logical blow to Christianity? The Christians weren’t even able to grasp that they had attributed the wrong father to their “God”, Jesus Christ.

The Trinity doctrine asserts that Jesus Christ is God the Son. The phrase “Son of God” highlights Jesus’ humanity, while “God the Son” emphasizes his divinity, including his existence prior to his incarnation. It can’t be stressed enough that according to Christian theology Jesus Christ *always* existed. Prior to his incarnation, he was God the Son, the Logos, the Word. As the Gospel of John says [1:1-4]: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The Word was with God at the beginning, and through him all things came to be; no single thing was created without him. All that came to be was alive with his life and that life was the light of men.”

John then declares [1:14]: “So the Word became flesh; he came to dwell among us, and we saw his glory, such glory as befits the Father’s only Son, full of grace and truth.”

This is unambiguous. God the Son was the pre-incarnation, eternal Word. The Son of God (Jesus Christ) was the “Word made flesh” (the Incarnation). And after the death of Jesus Christ, the Word continued, but now with a dimension that had fully experienced the human condition. There was never a single second of Jesus’ existence when he was not God the Son.

But now consider what Matthew 1:18 says about the birth of Jesus Christ: “When his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they came together she was found to be with child from the Holy Spirit.”

And Luke 1:26-35 says: “In the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God to a city of Galilee named Nazareth, to a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David. And the virgin’s name was Mary. And he came to her and said, ‘Greetings, O favoured one, the Lord is with you!’ But she was greatly troubled at the saying, and tried to discern what sort of greeting this might be. And the angel said to her, ‘Do not be afraid, Mary, for you have found favour with God. And behold, you will conceive in your womb and bear a son, and you shall call his name Jesus. He will be great and will be called the Son of the Most High. And the Lord God will give to him the throne of his father David, and he will reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there will be no end.’ And Mary said to the angel, ‘How will this be, since I am a virgin?’ And the angel answered her, ‘The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the child to be born will be called holy – the Son of God.’”

So, the Virgin Mary conceives Jesus by the *Holy Spirit*. In which case, how can Jesus be the incarnation of God the Son as he has to be if God the Son and the Son of God are to be identified as the same person? Jesus Christ was not the Word made Flesh but the Holy Spirit made flesh!

What we have here is a classic conflict of Mythos and Logos, perhaps the best example in history. Mythos logic declares that it is ridiculous to say that God the Son is the father of the Son of God – it seems to imply that a person can be his own father. Yet Logos logic declares that it is absurd to say that the Holy Spirit is the father of the Son of God because the Holy Spirit, according to Trinity theory, is manifestly not God the Son hence how can God the Son and the Son of God (Jesus Christ) be one and the same? If the Holy Spirit impregnated Mary then the divine substance of Jesus Christ is that of the Holy Spirit, not of God the Son. Hence Jesus Christ, Son of God, has no connection with God the Son. Hence Christianity is based on a fatal contradiction!

Why has no one noticed this before? Because people have always looked at Christianity through Mythos rather than Logos eyes.

Mythos logic says that God the Son cannot be the father of the Son of God because it’s a perverse idea, so another candidate must be found, and the Holy Spirit – the presence of God

within Creation – is the best candidate. Yet if the Trinity theory is able to distinguish between the Holy Spirit and God the Son then the Holy Spirit simply cannot be the father because Jesus is then inextricably linked to him and not to God the Son.

Christianity has been an immense Mythos lie. Mythos people can't see Logos problems. They live in Storyland, not in reality. Think of the millions and even billions of hours that have been spent on reading the Bible and not one Christian has ever realised that Jesus Christ has the *wrong* father. Probably no Christian has even thought about it.

\*\*\*\*\*

To recap, the Trinity consists of God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit. God the Son is equated with Jesus Christ, but the Bible says that it was the Holy Spirit that impregnated Mary. Therefore, the Holy Spirit is much closer to Jesus Christ than God the Son since the Holy Spirit is Christ's father and supplier of his divine essence!!!

Is this logical bombshell not the logical disproof of Christianity according to its own theological parameters?

The utter falsehood of Christianity is demonstrated by this debacle over the identity of Jesus' celestial father. On the one hand, we are told that God the Son is an eternal being and Jesus Christ was his earthly incarnation, ergo God the Son must be Jesus Christ's "father" since Jesus Christ is simply the Son of God incarnated in a human body on earth (but retaining his divine nature, side by side with a perfect human nature in one person). Yet Christianity then declares the Holy Spirit, not God the Son, to be the father of the Son of God. *Impossible!*

The logical blunder was inevitable because no one would have accepted the perverse and ridiculous idea of the Son of God being fathered by HIMSELF. Christianity destroyed the "logic" of its own position because of the emotional repulsiveness and extreme paradox of a son being his own father.

And thus the absolute intellectual dishonesty and downright lies of Christianity are exposed. If the Holy Spirit, not God the Son, was Jesus Christ's father then Jesus Christ was an incarnation of the Holy Spirit, which turns Christianity on its head and makes it a religion of the *Holy Spirit*. End of story.

Wake up, Christians. See through the deceit. Your "holy" leaders have lied relentlessly to you. Their concept of the Trinity is preposterous in every way. If the Trinity falls, Christianity falls with it. If the Trinity is false, Jesus Christ is not God and your worship of him is in vain. Turn to the light. See the truth for the first time in your life. You have been the victim of false prophets lying relentlessly to you and you were stupid enough to believe them. Why? Because they brainwashed you, and because you are gullible, poorly educated and have a low IQ.

\*\*\*\*\*

The other catastrophe for the concept of the Incarnation is what it implies about the human soul. Did Jesus Christ have a human soul or not? If he didn't then he can't be regarded as human. If he did, he wasn't God because God doesn't have a human soul.

A host of questions arise, none of which has ever been addressed by Christian theology. Does God have a soul? If not, why not? Is he soulless, hence a strange alien entity utterly different from those who are supposed to be made in his image? Does each of the persons of the Trinity have a separate soul? Do they somehow share the same soul? Do the human and divine natures of the person Jesus Christ share the same soul, or are there two immiscible souls, or is there a blend of human and divine souls, or is there only a human soul but no divine soul, or only a divine soul but no human soul?

The silence from Christian theologians is resounding. They have no answers whatever. You would discover absolutely nothing about the nature of the soul by reading the Christian Bible. Is that not remarkable? What kind of religion is it that can't define the soul?

## **The Science of Divine Conception?**

ACCORDING TO CHRISTIANITY, Jesus Christ did not have a natural human father and no male sperm was involved in his conception. At this point, of course, all Logos thinkers burst out laughing, but the Mythos people lap it up because, as we've said, they don't care about truth, reason or logic.

We know from the Christian gospels that Jesus Christ was in no way regarded as a divine being by his contemporaries. Pontius Pilate certainly didn't think he was judging a supernatural



being. The leaders of Jesus' Jewish enemies thought he was a blasphemer, not God. Plainly, he came across as just another person, albeit one making grandiose claims. But there were many would-be Jewish Messiahs at that time; he was just another of the lunatic species.

Let's assume that a "divine sperm" of the Holy Spirit fertilised the human egg of Mary. The egg and the sperm each carry a half-set of chromosomes and when they fuse together they make a full set of chromosomes (46 for a human being). The chromosomes carry the genes. Half of Jesus' genes would have been divine and half human (are divine genes dominant and human genes recessive?). Yet these "divine" genes would have to function exactly like human genes and be entirely compatible with them. What are we to conclude? That the Holy Spirit designed a perfect human sperm that somehow was divine "substance" yet seemed exactly like regular human sperm?

A baby grows thanks to the food and drink that the mother consumes. So, the divine DNA must have been able to operate on regular organic matter. What we know, then, is that the Holy Spirit's sperm was made of something completely compatible with regular terrestrial matter and interacted normally with a human egg and developed in normal human fashion, processing food and drink normally. So the "divine substance" of Jesus Christ could not have been in any way material but something purely immaterial embedded in normal material. It was informational and mental, not physical.

It must be the case that divine substance and terrestrial matter are fully compatible, implying that humans can become God. Christianity says so, so it must be true, right?!

The people who wrote the Gospels knew nothing of science, of chromosomes, genes, and DNA. The theologians who debated the nature of the incarnation were equally ignorant. They had an excuse for their lack of knowledge, but nowadays everyone has studied basic biology. Every believer in the divinity of Jesus Christ must be able to reconcile Jesus' man-God nature with Biology 101. Anyone who fails to do so reveals that they are retarded. Would the Pope like to explain the properties of Jesus' DNA? Or will he declare it a "mystery"?

But there's no mystery. It's all total bullshit.

Why aren't all Christian religious leaders, priest, pastors, vicars and reverends forced to account for Christ's DNA? Come on, give us all a laugh. Why isn't that fraud in the White House forced to declare to the world how Christ's DNA works? So much for a Harvard education! Why isn't his wife paraded in her new designer dress to explain it all to us? Why aren't the two daughters given a photo-op and press conference to explain divine DNA to us? Why isn't the cretinous Bush family with all their born-again bullcrap made to face the world and let us all have the benefit of their brilliant scientific analysis of the artificial insemination techniques of the Holy Spirit that cause the divine substance of someone completely different – God the Son – to be fused perfectly with Mary's DNA. Perhaps they'd also like to comment on the biological considerations that apply to Mary having been "immaculately conceived" even though she had a human mother and father.

If you call yourself a Christian, it ought to be compulsory for you to write 1,000 words on the biology of Jesus Christ and how it reflects divinity.

Seriously, why should religion not be compelled to front up and explain religious phenomena in scientific terms? How can we say we prize education if we allow the God Squad in the White House to hide behind superstition and faith?

There should be no hiding places. Religion isn't inherently anti-scientific, but Abrahamism certainly is. A definite ruling should be made by the Supreme Court regarding Darwinism and genetics in relation to Jesus Christ. Let's settle this matter once and for all. Let's stop hiding behind "respect" for people's religious beliefs.

It should be illegal for Abrahamists to be allowed to spread, unchallenged, retarded superstitions throughout the world. The Logos version of Illuminism fully explains the whole of science. Shouldn't scientific compatibility be a basic requirement of any religion acknowledged by the State?

It's time for the phoney war between Abrahamism and science to end. Everyone must choose. The debate must be held. Science must be allowed to prosecute Abrahamism and vice versa. Then we can all judge for ourselves who's right and who's wrong.

## **The Arian Heresy**

NO HERESY WAS MORE dangerous to orthodox Christianity than Arianism. By relegating God the Son to an inferior status to God the Father, the horrendous difficulties of the Trinitarian concept were abolished at a stroke. There was only one God after all, and he wasn't divided into three. God the Son was God's finest creation – a super angel – but he wasn't God.

All Gnostic Christians were Arians. They regarded Christ as a messenger sent by the True God to reveal the Gnostic truth to humanity and to act as an exemplar, showing humanity how to achieve gnosis. In Gnostic Christianity, the virgin birth, the Incarnation, the crucifixion, the resurrection, Original Sin, baptism, grace and Jesus' place in the Trinity – i.e. all the hardest things to believe about Christianity – were simply abolished.

In some Gnostic systems, an enormous number of divine beings, known as “aeons” mediate between humanity and the ultimate, unreachable God, Abraxas. The lowest of the aeons in these systems, the one who had contact with human beings, was Jesus Christ! (In non-Christian Gnosticism, Jesus Christ was regarded as a senior agent of the Demiurge and an entirely malevolent individual.)

Arius famously declared: “If God the Son was begotten of the Father, does that not imply that the Father existed before him?”

Despite all the huffing and puffing of Christian theologians regarding eternity, Arius' case is unarguable. There must have been a definable period when the begetter existed and the begotten did not; otherwise the word begotten is devoid of meaning. No Christian has ever addressed that simple, salient fact.

Arius said of the Son: “He is Son: therefore posterior to the Father; therefore not eternal. Since the Father is Eternal and the Son not, He is unlike the Father.”

This is absolutely correct but the blustering Christian theologians maintained that the Son was begotten in eternity and that terms such as “before” and “after” (temporal, ordering terms) were meaningless in relation to atemporal eternity. If this was their stance then they should have refrained from using a word like “begotten” (expressing a sequential relation between the begetter and the begotten, the former necessarily preceding the latter) and declared that Father and Son co-existed in eternity and from the beginning of time – but then it would be absurd to use the terms “Father” and “Son”, and if those terms were removed in the interests of logic, all scriptural references to Father and Son would become bogus and fallacious. In order to protect the Scriptures, the theologians of the Trinity had to abandon logic and appeal to the vagueness of “eternity” to save their Trinity definition. Anyone who agrees with Arius that “begotten” expresses a relation in which the begetter MUST precede the begotten, regardless of eternity, MUST reject the Trinity.

Arius was perfectly happy to acknowledge the Son as a super-angelic being, the first and highest creature of God, and the only being directly created by God – isn't that good enough? Jesus Christ himself at no point expressed an opinion different from this.

Arius agreed that the Father brought the Son into being so that the universe might be created by and through the Son. The Father gave the Son the most exalted position in Creation as the author of the rest of Creation.

Nevertheless, the fact remained that God the Father (“unbegotten”) always existed and was separate from the Son (“only-begotten”), born before time began, yet not eternal since there was a time when he was not yet begotten hence did not exist. The Father, Arius said, created the Holy Spirit through the Son, and the Holy Spirit was as subservient to the Son as the Son was to the Father. The Father was “the only true God” and Arius cited 1 Corinthians 8:5-6 as proof: **Indeed, even though there may be so-called gods in heaven or on earth — as in fact there are many gods and many lords — yet for us there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things and for whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and through whom we exist.**

These words of St Paul unambiguously identify the Father as the “one God” and Jesus Christ as the “one Lord” (i.e. lesser than God).

Arius wrote: “But we say and believe and have taught, and do teach, that the Son is not unbegotten, nor in any way part of the unbegotten; and that he does not derive his subsistence from any matter; but that by his own will and counsel he has subsisted before time and before ages as perfect God, only begotten and unchangeable, and that before he was begotten, or created, or purposed, or established, he was not. For he was not unbegotten. We are persecuted, because we say that the Son has a beginning, but that God is without beginning.”

Can any logical person seriously argue with Arius' case? Is it not airtight? How can any God who was “begotten” be the True God? The God that begat him MUST have precedence.

Arius taught that God was alone, unknowable, and separate from every created being. The Son, the creative Logos created by God, was therefore patently NOT God, but through the Logos the Father brought forth the world and all its contents.

Arius rejected the idea that the Son was of the same substance as the Father. Jesus Christ, the human Incarnation of God the Son, was even further removed from the Father.

The orthodox theologians decided that the only way to combat Arius was to insist that the

Son be defined as being of one substance with Father. Arius was prepared to accept the Greek word *Homoiousion* (of *like* substance) but not *Homooousion* (of the *same* substance), resulting in the cynical gibe that “Christendom was convulsed by a diphthong”, yet it has also been said by orthodox theologians that the whole Christian faith rests on that same diphthong.

By using *homooousion*, the orthodox came dangerously close to the Sabellian heresy that the Father and Son were identical (indeed the Sabellians had used this precise word in their arguments, asserting that “Father” and “Son” were simply separate modes of a single being). Moreover, by talking of “substance”, theologians were flirting with materialism. What exactly is this “God substance”? Where is it? How can it be divided between three persons but still be One? Yet the orthodox found the concept invaluable because if the Son was of the same substance of the Father then he must enjoy the same traits as the Father – eternal existence, immutability, perfection.

\*\*\*\*\*

Arius not only challenged the concept of the Trinity, he also questioned the traditional view of the Incarnation, again producing a radically more logical view. He asserted that the Son took only human flesh but not a human soul, which remained purely his own. Jesus Christ was thus a super-angelic soul in possession of a human body – the type of definition that applies to the Phosters and Archons of Illuminism. The Archon Gabriel was of this nature, as was his son by Mary: Jesus Christ.

Eager to counter Arius’ heretical view regarding the Incarnation, Bishop Apollinaris himself fell into heresy. This is a frequent occurrence. Nearly all Christian doctrines are poised on a knife-edge. If you overreact to a heresy in one direction, you invariably trigger a heresy in the opposite direction. So it was with Apollinaris. He was determined to show that God the Son was truly present in the Incarnation. He argued that if an intelligence operated in Christ other than the Word (God the Son) then this would mean that Christ had two personalities, human and divine. This, Apollinaris thought (rightly!), was not only very strange but must diminish Christ in relation to God the Son, so he declared: “He was God, therefore He had not a human intelligence.”

Modern liberals adopted a somewhat similar approach when they questioned the consciousness of Christ. Did he have a human consciousness or a divine consciousness? They were equating consciousness with personality, which seems entirely justifiable. After all, what would your personality be if you were unconscious? Yet theologians like to pretend that personality cannot be equated with consciousness and they have an understanding of personality that makes it more like an abstract relation than an executive agent i.e. they maintain that two consciousnesses or intelligences (divine and human) could belong to a single personality, although they fail to explain how.

The conclusion of the liberals was that if Christ had two personalities, human and divine, then he had a fallible human intelligence in addition to an infallible divine intelligence, hence he was not God. This analysis is absolutely correct.

As for Apollinaris, he ditched the human intelligence of Jesus Christ and thus became a heretic. We challenge any Christian to account for how the divine intelligence, nature, consciousness and personality of Jesus Christ can co-exist and operate simultaneously and effectively with the human intelligence, nature, consciousness and personality of Jesus Christ.

## Unitarianism

UNITARIANS INSIST THAT GOD is one person, not three. He is God the Father, and Jesus Christ is entirely separate from him, and of different substance. Because they have a radically different understanding of Christ’s significance, Unitarians reject orthodox doctrines such as original sin, predestination, and Biblical inerrancy.

Unitarians maintain that Jesus was a great man, a prophet, perhaps even a supernatural being, but certainly not God himself. They insist, correctly, that Jesus never claimed to be God, and never mentioned the triune God anywhere. They ascribe moral authority to him, not divinity. Jesus, for them, is virtually identical to what Mohammed is for Islam.

Some Unitarians say that Jesus had a pre-human existence (i.e. was a supernatural being), while others say that he did not (i.e. like Mohammed). When Jesus referred to God as his “Father”, he was either asserting that he was a supernatural being created directly by the Father or that he was a “Son of God” because he had been specifically chosen by God to be his prophet, but in no sense was God himself.

The Unitarians are simply modern-day Arians, and their relationship to their prophet is the

same as that of Muslims to Mohammed. It would be radically easier for Unitarians to claim to believe in the same God as the Jews and Muslims than for Trinitarians to make the same claim. The Trinity is beyond the pale in terms of monotheism.

Unitarianism is much more logical, straightforward and monotheistic than Trinitarianism. In many ways, it's astounding that the Trinitarians defeated the Unitarians as the representatives of orthodox Christianity. Then again, it would be rather absurd to worship the prophet rather than the God. If Christ isn't God then, logically, there's no such thing as Christianity, just as there is no such religion as Mohammedism.

\*\*\*\*\*

*Tritheism* resolves the difficulties of the Trinity by proclaiming the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as three separate and distinct Gods. The Tritheists were, of course, exterminated.

Ironically, Muslims view orthodox Trinitarian Christianity as Tritheistic. Mormonism also holds that Father, Son and Holy Spirit are all different beings and not part of a single Godhead.

## The "Person" Debate

THE TRINITY DEBATE IS essentially a dispute over the meaning of the word "person".

Boethius defined a person as "an individual substance of a rational nature." Thomas Aquinas said, "It would seem that 'person' is the same as 'hypostasis,' 'subsistence,' and 'essence'."

Aquinas went on to define a person as "what is most perfect in all nature – that is, a subsistent individual of a rational nature."

Modern commentators on Aquinas often say that he did not use *persona* in the modern sense of an autonomous centre of consciousness, yet the definition we have just cited seems more or less to amount to the same thing.

Saint Augustine said: "When we speak of the person of the Father, we mean nothing else but the substance of the Father, for person is said in regard to Himself, and not in regard to the Son."

Here he emphasised *substance*, but at other times he spoke of *relations*. To talk of substance tends to imply physical difference i.e. the persons of the Trinity, while sharing the same substance, are autonomous expressions of that substance (they have their own unique share of the common substance). To talk of relations tends to imply a mental phenomenon: the Freudian Id, Ego and Superego form a set of internal mental relations, but they all belong to a single person.

Aquinas wrote: "*person* in men and angels does not signify relation, but something absolute. Therefore, if in God it signified relation, it would bear an equivocal meaning in God, in man, and in angels... The different sense of the less common term does not produce equivocation in the more common. Although a horse and an ass have their own proper definitions, nevertheless they agree univocally in animal, because the common definition of animal applies to both. So it does not follow that, although relation is contained in the signification of divine person, but not in that of an angelic or of a human person, the word *person* is used in an equivocal sense. Though neither is it applied univocally, since nothing can be said univocally of God and creatures."

When a theologian starts saying that something can be described neither equivocally nor univocally, it's clear he doesn't know what he's talking about.

Frankly, the problem of defining the Trinity proved too much for orthodox Christian theologians, even of the high intelligence of Augustine and Aquinas.

Any over-emphasis on the separateness of the three persons gave rise to heresies like those of Arius. Any over-emphasis on the unity and oneness led to the heresy of Sabellius. The Trinity thus ended up being a statement of what it was not: it was not the Arian heresy and nor was it the Sabellian heresy. It was thus left as some nebulous, empty formula. As long as you kept repeating the words of the formula – three persons in One God – you would be fine and the Inquisitors wouldn't come calling. If you tried to define what you were saying, watch out!

A contemporary internet commentator expressed disbelief that people were confused over the Trinity and pontificated that it was just like an atom containing electrons, protons and neutrons: three types of thing in one. He thus reveals his absolute ignorance of atomic physics and the Trinity doctrine. In the Trinity doctrine, all three persons are of identical substance. In what sense are electrons, protons and neutrons of identical substance, except in the unhelpful scientific sense that *everything* in the material world is made of energy?

Does one pop group containing three singers equate to the Trinity? That's the sort of "logic" the atom man applies. A group isn't a monotheistic God. The Trinity would be a perfectly rational concept if it asserted that it was a group of three Gods. That's not what it asserts. Its claim is that ONE God can exist in three persons who are not three independent Gods. In terms of a pop

example, it would be like saying that Beyonce could exist in three persons, all equal and of the same substance. Imagine having three interviews with Beyonce in which in each interview she claimed to be a different person. Would you regard her as three persons in one Beyonce or as mad?

Were the twelve Greek gods of Mount Olympus representatives of a single Greek Godhead? We could easily assert that one God comprised twelve “persons”. That each god had a separate body, role, intelligence etc would be neither here nor there; after all, don’t Jehovah, Jesus and the Holy Spirit all act differently, manifest themselves differently, have distinct intelligences and so forth? By this reckoning, all religions are really “monotheistic”. Hindus claim that their religion is a monotheism despite its enormous pantheon: all the apparently different gods are really just different manifestations of the One.

The word “person” is derived from the Latin *persona*: the mask worn by an actor. Different masks (such as for sadness, happiness, horror) depicted different things, so there were different *personas*, or roles, for the actor to assume. By regarding the world as the stage of life, we all become actors with our parts to play and our *personas* to don. And so *persona* – the actor’s mask – came to be applied to an individual: to a *person*. We are all just actors wearing a mask, and in fact we have many masks: a mask for home and for work, for when we’re with our friends, our lovers, our families, our enemies, our colleagues, when we’re in a formal situation or an informal one. Many of our masks are of course fake: they don’t reflect the real us at all. We put them on for convenience and social acceptability and thus we gradually become inauthentic and start living in bad faith. We go through our lives as frauds.

“Life’s but a walking shadow, a poor player, / That struts and frets his hour upon the stage, / And then is heard no more; it is a tale / Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, / Signifying nothing.”  
-- Shakespeare (*Macbeth*)

To get an idea of how complex the concept of “person” is when applied to the Christian Trinity, consider these remarks from the online Catholic Encyclopaedia:

**For the constitution of a person it is required that a reality be subsistent and absolutely distinct, i.e. incommunicable. The three Divine realities are relations, each identified with the Divine Essence. A finite relation has reality only in so far as it is an accident; it has the reality of inherence. The Divine relations, however, are in the nature not by inherence but by identity. The reality they have, therefore, is not that of an accident, but that of a subsistence. They are one with *ipsum esse subsistens*. Again every relation, by its very nature, implies opposition and so distinction. In the finite relation this distinction is between subject and term. In the infinite relations there is no subject as distinct from the relation itself; the Paternity is the Father--and no term as distinct from the opposing relation; the Filiation is the Son. The Divine realities are therefore distinct and mutually incommunicable through this relative opposition; they are subsistent as being identified with the subsistence of the Godhead, i.e. they are persons. The use of the word *persona* to denote them, however, led to controversy between East and West. The precise Greek equivalent was *prosopon*, likewise used originally of the actor’s mask and then of the character he represented, but the meaning of the word had not passed on, as had that of *persona*, to the general signification of individual. Consequently *tres personae*, *tria prosopa*, savoured of Sabellianism to the Greeks. On the other hand their word *hypostasis*, from *hypo-histemi*, was taken to correspond to the Latin *substantia*, from *sub-stare*. *Tres hypostases* therefore appeared to conflict with the Nicaean doctrine of unity of substance in the Trinity. This difference was a main cause of the Antiochene schism of the fourth century. Eventually in the West, it was recognized that the true equivalent of *hypostasis* was not *substantia* but *subsistentia*, and in the East that to understand *prosopon* in the sense of the Latin *persona* precluded the possibility of Sabellian interpretation. By the First Council of Constantinople, therefore, it was recognized that the words *hypostasis*, *prosopon*, and *persona* were equally applicable to the three Divine realities.**

So is everything clear now? As clear as mud! What is plain is that no average Christian comprehends the Trinity in terms of this meretricious, pseudo-philosophical wordplay that amounts to nothing more than pretentious and fraudulent gibberish, full of *non sequiturs* and illegitimate conclusions. “The Divine realities are therefore distinct and mutually

incommunicable through this relative opposition; they are subsistent as being identified with the subsistence of the Godhead, i.e. they are persons.” – note how the desired conclusion (that there are three persons in one God) is arrived at not by logical argument but by sophistry. In case you can’t follow the intricacies of gobbledegook, what is being asserted is that definitions that apply to human beings (finite entities) are different from those that apply to divine beings (infinite entities), hence it’s allegedly possible to construct definitions that are absurd and meaningless in relation to humans, but precise and perfect in relation to divinities. In the Godhead, there are three relations: paternity, filiation and spiritual link, and, in divine terms, relations are the same as persons so there is a Father, Son and Holy Spirit (“In the infinite relations there is no subject as distinct from the relation itself.”) Putting it another way – “It is necessary for us to have three persons in one God so we will construct a set of definitions, no matter how ludicrous, to give us the result we want.”

It’s staggering that anyone can take this sophistry seriously. Much more worryingly, it’s quite clear that no Christian anywhere can meaningfully define the Trinity, so all Christians are literally declaring their belief in something they all find utterly incomprehensible.

In early usage, “person” wasn’t associated with the concept of personality, self-awareness, will and rationality. Instead, it denoted an individual in the sense of an individuated instance of a substance, separate from all other instances of that substance. Thus to say that God existed in three persons was technically to say little more than that there were three instances of the God substance. To call Jesus Christ a person was to say that he was an instance (uniquely) of “God-man” substance.

For Saint Augustine, the concept of the Trinity was intended to do little more than assert that the Father wasn’t the Son and the Spirit was neither Father nor Son, and beyond that little more could be said. Saint Anselm helpfully described God as an “ineffable plurality” and “ineffable unity”, which certainly clarifies the mystery!

The three persons were in no way to be considered three separate beings, but three instances of a common substance. Therefore, technically, it was absolutely wrong to think of one “being” of God entering into Jesus Christ in some intimate union, while leaving behind the other two God beings (although this is unquestionably how most people rationally think about the Incarnation), but rather that a “threefoldness” applied to God and this threefoldness became incarnate in Jesus Christ with a greater emphasis on the God the Son aspect of the threefoldness (since the “Son” continually referred to his “Father”), and a lesser emphasis on the God the Father and God the Holy Spirit “persons”, which were nevertheless fully present since there is only ONE God.

Many Christian theologians keep stressing this point that “person” as understood 2,000-1,500 years ago when the Trinity doctrine was formed is radically different from “person” as understood today, and that the modern person is therefore not thinking of the Trinity in the right way. Well, here’s our reply to that. If the Trinity exists then it exists no matter what people understand by the term “person”. If the proper definition of “person” in relation to the Trinity has become obscured by modern usage then it falls to all Trinitarians to create a *new* definition suitable for the modern audience.

Surely that’s not too much to ask. Surely the Trinity isn’t a permanent prisoner of ancient definitions. If it can’t be translated into modern language then it is MEANINGLESS. Otherwise, we’d still be trying to explain all of chemistry with regard to the four ancient elements of earth, water, air and fire. Our understanding has EVOLVED. Surely it should be much easier to explain the Trinity in the present day given that we have a far more complex understanding of the world. Or is the difficulty for Trinitarians that they know that their definitions are bogus, discredited, outdated and incapable of being reconciled with modern knowledge? Everyone knows that it’s impossible to have three modern persons in One God. What language can theologians fall back on to continue to deceive the believers?

In practical terms, Christians refer to *one* God when they are emphasising that they are monotheists, and they refer to *three* Gods when they want to focus on the independent actions of Jesus Christ, God the Father and the Holy Spirit. In other words, they engage in doublethink and switch between One God and Three Gods whenever it suits them. That’s the essence of the Trinity: it can be two contradictory things at once, and that allows it to be very flexible and powerful in terms of Mythos (providing the Logos absurdities of the situation are ignored, which they always are). Only the intellectually dishonest and irrational could ever subscribe to the Trinity doctrine.

On the internet, someone wrote:

**I am trying to help a Jewish friend understand the concept of the Trinity. He has asked a question and I want to make sure I get it right. The Trinity is a belief in one Being in three**

**persons. One God, not three Gods.**

**My friend asked: What does “person” mean when talking of the Trinity? Does it mean “character”? Does it have to do with “personality”? One God with three personalities? One God in three beings? One God in three characters? One God in three masks? What does it *mean*? That’s my problem with understanding the Trinity. Using a term doesn’t mean that either you or your audience understands it. I never received a satisfactory answer.**

**Any input would be appreciated.**

**Thanks.**

This question perfectly encapsulates the problem. But it also raises the issue of why the questioner is (presumably) a Christian if he doesn’t understand the central doctrine of Christianity. And that’s true of ALL Christians, of course. None of them understand the Trinity and none of them understand the Incarnation, and yet it’s hard to see how you could be a Christian if you don’t understand these things. Are people in the habit of fanatically proclaiming their belief in things they don’t comprehend? It seems they are.

The questioner then came up with the following reply for his Jewish friend:

**First I would like to point out that I am no expert in explaining the Trinity. I can tell you what I believe though.**

**The word “person” carries a lot of baggage in my opinion. The use of the word “person” brings to our human minds three people, like Tom, Dick and Harry. All three are people and all three are separate beings.**

**My being is shared by one person and that is me.**

**This is not how the word “person” is used in the Trinity. In the nature of the one God, the One Being who is God, there are three centers of consciousness, who we call “persons”. These persons are equal. The Trinity is an absolute unity and they relate to one another in love. The Trinity is relational.**

**Unlike people or human persons, the persons of the Trinity not separable from one another, they indwell each other.**

**Some Trinitarian scholars refer to the “persons” as hypostasis – substance, essence. The person of the Word/Son is made out of the same essence as the Father because the Son proceeds from the Father.**

**Within the one Being who is God, there are three definite “persons”. They are not each 1/3 God and not 3 Gods, but one God and only One God.**

**I have no problem using the word “person” now that I know what lies behind it.**

This is quite a good stab at an answer, but it immediately raises the spectre of the Sabellian heresy by over-emphasising the unity of the three persons. If the persons are simply centres of consciousness then how do they physically act separately? They can only act mentally separately. And if they can act mentally separately why does that not make them equivalent to three different Gods, contrary to what the questioner has stated?

But the Bible clearly shows the Father, Son and Holy Ghost to have different physical manifestations, to fulfil separate functions, and to have different levels of understanding. The Old Testament is all about the Father and there is no mention of the other two. In the New Testament the focus is on the Son, with the Holy Spirit appearing independently (at Christ’s baptism, and to the Apostles at Pentecost), so “centres of consciousness” just doesn’t cut it.

When people talk of God the Son becoming Incarnate in Jesus Christ, are they referring to a centre of consciousness entering Jesus? That sounds like the Apollinarian heresy. Aren’t the “God the Father” and “God the Holy Spirit” consciousnesses necessarily present too, in which case it becomes pointless to talk of God the Son becoming incarnate.

The Sabellian heresy talks of God operating in three modes, or being perceived as acting in three different modes, and that’s exactly what the above answer implies. All three centres of consciousness were present in Jesus Christ but only the Son of God centre was perceived by others (and by Jesus himself).

So, such is the absurdity of the Christian religion that even a reasonably clued-up Christian can’t avoid falling into heresy. If heretics are all going to Hell, can ANY Christian feel safe? Remember, in Christianity, you don’t save yourself from Hell by believing in the wrong things; you have to believe in the *right* things i.e. you need to know exactly what you believe in and what you don’t. Otherwise, you’re *damned* to the eternal hellfire like all the heretics before you.

## The Soul of Christ

SO, DID CHRIST HAVE a human soul, a divine soul or both?

What is a soul? It is normally taken to be the “animating principle”. If Christ had a human soul then it means he was animated in human terms, not divine, hence he was not God. If he had two souls then which one was actually animating him? How is it possible to have two souls in any case? Wouldn’t a human soul be overwhelmed in the presence of a divine soul, meaning that Christ only had a divine soul, hence was not human?

Can a human soul mix with a divine soul? Human souls are created but divine souls are eternal. Human souls, being created from nothing, are not of the same substance as divine souls. How can a created soul and an eternal soul co-exist and work together if they are different substances?

Some people argue that God can’t be said to have a soul for the simple reason that he doesn’t have a body. His “substance” is itself the animating principle. In this sense, he doesn’t have a soul; he IS soul. But what does that imply in relation to Jesus Christ? The divine nature of the person of Christ was self-animating, but the human body and nature of Christ were “powered” by his human soul. It therefore doesn’t sound as if the divine nature of Jesus Christ was fully integrated with his human nature. It looks much more like the case of a human being experiencing divine possession, which is hardly the same as Incarnation. God possessing a man is not the same as God becoming a man. This is the adoptionist heresy.

To explain his stance, the heretic Bishop Apollinaris resorted to the *trichotomist* theory of human nature: an individual consists of body, animal soul and rational soul (called “the spirit”) rather than just body and soul. This allowed him to say that Christ had a human body and animal soul while the rational soul (spirit) was supplied by the eternal Word (Logos). This stratagem avoided attributing to the Word, the lower, animal functions of the human soul.

For Apollinaris, the “soul” was simply the impersonal life principle of the body common to the animal world, while the “spirit” was the origin of all personality, rational ability and everything that was distinct and human about the individual. The orthodox critics of Apollinaris said that to deny Christ a human spirit was to render Jesus a mere automaton like a Cartesian animal: he was simply an animated physical vessel occupied by the divine Logos i.e. Jesus Christ was no more than a host for the Word. He was a hollow human being, a shell, devoid of the precise quality – a complete human soul and spirit – that would make him human.

What Apollinaris had done was to deny the existence of a rational human soul (*nous*) in Christ’s human nature and claim that it was fully replaced by the divine Logos. This had the further implication that Christ’s body, being under the spiritual control of the divine Logos, was glorified and spiritually perfected, unlike the bodies of the rest of the humanity. Apollinaris thus rendered Christ fundamentally different in nature from all other human beings since he did not possess a full human soul and also had a perfected body.

Another angle of attack on his doctrine was that it brought the eternal and perfect Word into the temporal and imperfect realm of successive thoughts. (The eternal Word, standing outside time sees all things at once; to make it take the place of the rational human soul destroys its eternal perspective and makes it changeable and fallible.)

Followers of Apollinarianism were generally accused of creating a *tertium quid* (“third thing”) which was neither God nor man. Ironically, the heresy of Apollinaris ended up with a strong resemblance to one aspect of the theology of his hated enemy Arius. Both, by denying that Christ had a normal human soul, were essentially saying that Christ was a divine being veiled with flesh. Some followers of Apollinaris even argued that the flesh itself became divine, thanks to being animated by the divine rather than human principle.

Another heretic, Bishop Nestorius, argued that there were not only two natures in Jesus Christ but, in effect, two distinct beings. Mary was the mother of Christ the man, but not the mother of God. This view came close to adoptionism i.e. Jesus Christ was just a human being adopted by God the Son. For Nestorius, Jesus was born a mere man to Mary, and only subsequently became imbued with a divine nature i.e. Nestorius was maintaining that Jesus Christ was a distinct human being with whom God then became united in one physical person.

The orthodox position was that Christ’s human nature, when first created by God (the Holy Spirit?) did not enjoy a single moment of exclusively human existence: it was always inextricably linked to its divine nature. In Nestorius’s view, on the contrary, Jesus’ human nature always had a separate existence, as did his divine nature. They were completely distinct rather than indissolubly unified. Nestorius maintained that the two natures could act independently, with some acts being attributed to the divine nature and others to the human – which sounds



suspiciously like multiple personality syndrome.

Some modern commentators have characterised Nestorius' doctrine as akin to a Clark Kent/ Superman dichotomy. The human Christ is a kind of Clark Kent figure while the divine Christ is Superman, so to speak. The man can shed his human persona at any time and transform himself into God. To be fair, Nestorius' position is rather more nuanced than that. Superman merely plays the part of Clark Kent but is never anything other than Superman whereas the human Christ and divine Christ are like two separate beings within one person. The analogy would be improved if Clark Kent were an ordinary human being who could metamorphose into Superman. Perhaps the Incredible Hulk furnishes a better comparison.

Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde may also provide a useful analogy. On the one hand, the two personas of Jekyll and Hyde correspond quite well to the Christian concept of two distinct natures within one person. The trouble is that they don't simultaneously coexist; one nature has to be released at the expense of the other. In orthodox Christianity, the two natures are required to permanently co-exist.

A more productive way of thinking about the problem might be in relation to the left-brain/ right brain dichotomy. Imagine Jesus Christ as having a human left brain (where his human consciousness resides) but a divine right brain that directs his unconscious mind. The two natures are therefore permanently joined together and work together as required by Christian orthodoxy, and yet Nestorius would have ammunition for maintaining that there are two distinct beings within the single person of Christ since the unconscious could theoretically act independently of the conscious mind, as is found in "split-brain" patients who have had the *corpus callosum* connecting the two hemispheres severed.

One of the reasons why we are so interested in the debate concerning the nature of Christ's Incarnation is the light it sheds on contemporary issues of brain/mind, left-brain/right-brain, consciousness/the unconscious, lower self/ higher self. So, a debate that seems ridiculously obscure and irrelevant turns out to be crucial to our understanding of the transition of man to God.

The heretic Eutyches, in attacking Nestorius's emphasis on the incompatibility of Christ's human and divine natures, fell into the error of claiming that Christ had only a single nature: that of the incarnate Word. Eutyches was willing to say that Christ's existence was OF two natures but not IN two natures. "One nature only after the Union," he and his supporters declared. They then said, just as the followers of Apollinaris had, that Christ's flesh was of a different nature from everyone else's, and some believed it to be intrinsically incorruptible.

Eutyches declared that Christ was "a fusion of human and divine elements." This fusion created one new, single (mono) nature in which Christ's human nature was "dissolved like a drop of honey in the sea" i.e. the finite human nature was subsumed by the infinite divine nature.

Eutyches created such a gulf between Christ's humanity and everyone else's that he was accused of a type of Docetism, the heresy that Christ only seemed to participate in the human condition and suffer as a human, but in reality did not suffer at all since his divinity totally protected him.

The Monophysite ("one nature") heresy arose from the Eutychian heresy (and had much in common with the Apollinarian heresy) and asserted, along with the doctrine of a single nature in Christ, that as a human soul was to the human body so was the divine element of Christ to the human i.e. the divine aspect controlled the human so absolutely as to make the divine the only aspect worth considering.

The technical definition of Monophysiticism may be expressed as: "Jesus Christ, who is identical with the Son of God, is one person and one hypostasis in one nature: divine-human, with the human aspect being very much absorbed by the divine.

The Egyptian Coptic Church of the present day subscribes to a version of the Monophysite doctrine called *Miaphysitism* which holds that in the one person of Jesus Christ, divinity and humanity are united in a single nature without separation, without confusion, and without alteration.

The Copts actually regard Eutyches as a heretic since he asserted that Christ's human nature was absorbed in the Divine Nature and all but dissolved by it, rendering Christ somewhat other than human. They, on the other hand, while endorsing the concept of a single nature, maintained that it could be simultaneously fully human and fully divine. They claimed that a union did not entail any untoward mingling of natures, citing the analogy of ignited iron, which preserves the natures of both fire and iron, while remaining a single entity.

The difference between the prefixes "mono" and "mia" is extremely subtle: "mono" means "one only" i.e. with an emphatic emphasis on oneness, while "mia" means "one"

*unemphatically*, thus allowing scope for a compound nature acting as a unity.

So, there are three positions: monophysitism asserts that Jesus Christ had a divine single nature; miaphysitism that he had a perfectly compounded human and divine *single* nature and *dyophysitism* (the orthodox position) that he had two *distinct* and *uncompounded* natures, human and divine, that nevertheless acted in perfect concert. The miaphysites accused the dyophysites of the Nestorian heresy, which they vehemently denied, and the dyophysites accused the miaphysites of the monophysite heresy, with they denied just as vehemently. Such are the nuances and fine margins of the Christian Incarnation doctrine. To avoid being a heretic you have to be the greatest expert in linguistic accuracy, semantics and translating foreign languages. Any tiny error and you slip into heresy and thus Hellfire! Who would have thought that God would damn you to Hell for having anything less than perfect language skills?

The Monothelite (“one will”) heresy was a clever modification of the Monophysite heresy and asserted that Christ had only one will: the divine. The Monothelites were willing to say that Christ had two natures as orthodoxy required but they said that he worked according to “one theandric operation” i.e. a single divine will. In other words, they had replaced the controversy over the dual or single nature of Christ with the same dilemma regarding his will: did he have a dual (human and divine) or single human will? This, of course, is a profound question. The orthodox have never answered it. All they have ever done is repeat their mantra that there are two natures (human and divine) in one person. Wisely (and cynically), they have refused to elaborate since they know they would fall into heresy if they attempted to offer any clarity about this extraordinarily improbable union.

Imagine trying to defend the proposition that the human and divine natures of Jesus Christ are eternally distinct yet simultaneously uniquely united and working in perfect harmony. If you go too far in asserting the distinctness of the two natures, you become a Nestorian heretic. If you go too far in the emphasising the unity and harmony of the two natures you become a Monophysite heretic. This situation in relation to the Incarnation is thus identical to the Trinity dilemma where the Arian and Sabellian heresies lie in wait for anyone who makes the three persons of the Trinity too distinct on the one hand or too close on the other.

Go on, ask a Christian to define the Trinity or Incarnation and laugh at them as they veer wildly from one heresy to another as you gently probe them with your well-informed questions.

\*\*\*\*\*

The official Condemnation of Eutyches: “Bewailing and lamenting his complete ruin, we [the bishops] decree through our Lord Jesus Christ, who has been by him blasphemed, that he is thrust out from all priestly office, and from our fellowship, and from the presidency of his monastery: and be it known to all men who after this converse with or visit him, that they lay themselves too under the sentence of excommunication, because they have not abstained from intercourse with him.”

\*\*\*\*\*

So, how many practising Christians of today would be able to say exactly what the orthodox Christian position on the Trinity and Incarnation is without blundering into one heresy or another and incurring excommunication and eternal damnation? The only reason why ALL Christians aren’t heretics is that they haven’t bothered to think enough about it. Of what value is the faith of the people who are saved from heresy only by laziness and ignorance? It is said that ignorance of the law is no defence. Well, neither is ignorance of the religion you profess.

Imagine that all “Christians” on Judgment Day are shown a gateway to Heaven and another to Hell. They are then sat down at a table with a pen and paper and given an exam on the Trinity and Incarnation and they are specifically asked to refute each of the major heresies to prove that they are “true” Christians and not disguised heretics. If they fail the exam they go straight to Hell. If that was scenario, would the gates of the Christian Heaven ever open?

Christians don’t have a clue what they believe. They subscribe to Christian doctrines simply because they’ve been told to, not because they understand what they’ve signed up to. The faith of morons is valueless. It certainly won’t open the gates of Heaven for them.

Christianity, theologically, is astoundingly complex because it is trying to hold together some of the most outlandish ideas ever presented. It dismally fails to be logical and coherent, but that’s not to say it doesn’t throw up a huge edifice of specious arguments that can easily fool the ill-educated.

## The Protestant Heresy

IT HAS BEEN ESTIMATED that there are 20-30,000 Protestant denominations, with 270 new ones being formed each year. By promoting the doctrine of “private judgment” Protestantism has become a complete joke. Anyone can create a new Protestant religion at the drop of a hat.

Although Protestantism exhibits an extraordinary range of different doctrines, all Protestant denominations stand by the teachings of *sola scriptura* (“by Scripture alone”: only the Bible can be used for composing theological doctrines – this is a direct attack on the Church’s right to define doctrine) and *sola fide* (“by faith alone”: the idea that we are justified by faith only and good deeds are worthless).

Protestantism directly contradicts 2 Peter 1:20-21: “Above all, you must understand that no prophecy of Scripture came about by the prophet’s own interpretation of things. For prophecy never had its origin in the human will, but prophets, though human, spoke from God as they were carried along by the Holy Spirit.” In other words, not even prophets are allowed to create new religions according to their own judgment.

Protestantism seeks to pit the Bible against the Catholic Church, denying that the *magisterium* has any infallible authority to teach and interpret Scripture. Anyone is as fit as the Pope to define Christianity. The history of Christianity and the many Catholic Councils is abolished in favour of whatever a Protestant thinks when he picks up and reads the Bible.

Jesus Christ told Saint Peter, the first Pope (Matt. 16:18): “You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell will not prevail against it”. The Catholic Church in the words of Saint Paul was (1 Tim. 3:15): “the pillar and foundation of the truth”.

In terms of the theological history of the Church and the official teachings of the Christian Councils, all Protestants are unquestionably heretics damned to eternal hellfire.

## The Jansenism Heresy

IN THE 17<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY, Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres in France, adopted an extremist Augustinian position, not unlike Protestantism. According to his heresy, Jesus Christ did not die for all men, but only for those who will be finally saved (the elect). They alone are granted divine grace. Everyone else is damned.

The brilliant but profoundly disturbed French thinker Blaise Pascal (1623-1662) was a Jansenist, which accounts for his gloomy, grim and fear-filled view of the world.

## The Shekinah Problem

THE *SHEKINAH* (Hebrew for “that which dwells or resides”) is God’s earthly presence, the “Glory of the Lord.” God himself transcends the world. The Shekinah can be compared with the Holy Spirit, and in Christianity it’s the Holy Spirit that enters the world to impregnate Mary and to descend on the Apostles at Pentecost.

With the Incarnation of Christ, it is being asserted that two persons of the Trinity can manifest on Earth (Son and Spirit), but not the third and most important (Father). What are the rules of divine manifestation? Shouldn’t we be told? Is there any actual obstacle to Jehovah appearing on earth? If so, he’s not all powerful. If not, what’s his problem?

\*\*\*\*\*

Jesus Christ was a Jew and his twelve Apostles were Jews. The original “Christians” were actually Jews who obeyed Jewish customs but who, unlike other Jews, acknowledged Christ as the Messiah. The Apostles’ understanding of Christ was very different from what became Christian orthodoxy when the Nicene Creed was proclaimed. There can be no question that all of Christ’s Jewish followers, and even Christ himself, would have been found guilty of heresy had they been around three or four centuries later.

The Hebrew Christian Church faded out of existence by the fifth century CE. Is it not a remarkable thing that Christianity died in the country in which it was born? That’s a remarkable “testament” to Christ’s Godliness, is it not? The country in which he chose to Incarnate utterly repudiated him. The Hebrew Christian Church – by far the Church that most accurately reflected Christ’s teachings – was never anything more than a tiny sect.

Isn’t it time that the rest of the world followed the example of the Hebrews and repudiated Christ? If they didn’t believe him even though he lived amongst them, preached to them and was

one of them, why should anyone else? Is it not rather revealing that the vast majority of those who actually knew him did not find him persuasive, while billions who never knew him do believe in him? Which group talks from an informed position?

## Trichotomy versus Dichotomy

THE *TRICHOTOMOUS* DOCTRINE is that a human being consists of a body, soul and spirit. The more common *dichotomous* view is that it consists only of a body and soul – the material and immaterial aspects – with “spirit” and “soul” being used interchangeably. Indeed, “soul” and “mind” are often regarded as the same the same thing. “Geist” – the word used by Hegel to describe the basic stuff of existence – means “mind/spirit”. Thus soul, spirit and mind – all being the mental rather than physical components of the human make-up – are usually treated collectively.

If they are treated as fundamentally different then awkward questions start to arise as to whether the soul and spirit can exist separately. Could one go to hell and one to heaven? All kinds of heresies can flood into any area where there is any ambiguity. For instance, if there is a distinction between the animal soul and rational soul, it could be deemed that the first is mortal while the second is immortal, or that the second actually belongs to God rather than man and returns to God on the death of the man, implying that there is no personal immortality for human beings. These are highly contentious areas theologically and philosophically and have generated endless metaphysical speculation.

In the Old Testament, soul is referred to as *nephesh* and spirit as *ruach*. In the New Testament, reflecting Greek terminology, the soul is *psyche* and the spirit *pneuma*.

## The Platonic Soul

THE PLATONIC SOUL was trichotomous, consisting of a lower desiring part linked to the body, a higher rational part linked to pure mind and a spirited part that somewhat mediated between the other two but was mostly on the side of the higher soul.

The higher part was called the *nous* (mind, intellect, logos, reason), the spirited, passionate, emotional part was the *thymos* and the appetitive or desiring part was called *epithymia* (or, alternatively, *eros*).

Bodily desires are ascribed to the appetitive epithymia, emotions such as anger, fear, joy to the thymos and nous is (ideally) the controlling part which subjugates the appetites with the aid of thymos.

The Platonic soul maps quite well to the Freudian psyche. The id is the epithymia, the ego the thymos, and the superego the nous.

## The Islamic Jesus

IT'S VALUABLE TO study what the Muslims say about Jesus Christ. In Islam, Jesus is the prophet who comes before Mohammed. As in Christianity, he was born of the Virgin Mary, this time via a miraculous decree of Allah. Given that the Christian Bible claims to be the holy revelation of God and asserts that Christ was fathered by the Holy Spirit while the Koran also claims to be the holy revelation of God and says that there is no such thing as the Holy spirit then we know for a fact that claims to infallibility of books of holy revelation are inherently unreliable. Either the Bible, the Koran, or both must be wrong about the identity of Jesus' father. One or both must be utterly false, hence utterly deceitful.

If Jesus and Mohammed were both prophets of the same God, isn't it extremely odd that they tell completely different stories about Jesus' "father"?

By claiming Jesus as an Islamic prophet, Mohammed perpetrated a catastrophic blunder because, at the same time, he was claiming that the revelation associated with Christianity was false, hence Satanic. He was therefore linking himself to the Satanic tradition of a false prophet and a false god (and of course Mohammed became infamously embroiled in the “Satanic Verses” controversy, where he admitted to being deceived by the Devil to water down Islam and make it more tolerant towards pagan gods).

Allah, according to the Islamic revelation, gave Jesus the ability to perform miracles (including curing the blind and raising the dead), but it was always understood to be Allah's power, not Jesus'.

In Islam, Jesus did not suffer crucifixion but underwent bodily ascension to heaven (what happened when he reached space?!) The crucifixion of Jesus Christ was, accordingly, an elaborate

illusion created by Allah (no explanation is offered as to why Allah would want to perform this magic trick). Islam entirely rejects the Christian view that Jesus was God incarnate, was crucified or resurrected, or ever atoned for the sins of mankind.

Before Jesus was conceived, the angel Gabriel told Mary: "When Allah wants to create matter, he merely wills it and the things come into being." The Koran therefore declares that Jesus was created by an act of Allah's will. One way or another, someone is telling us the most appalling lies. Either the Christians are total liars, or the Muslims are, or both are.

Islam claims to respect Christians as "People of the Book". Yet it repudiates the central tenets of the Christian "Book" and regards them as wicked lies. How does that amount to "respect"? Islam, via the Koran, in effect declares Christianity an infidel and Satanic religion that has wilfully corrupted the "true" story of Jesus Christ and created a false God: a complete affront to Allah. Islam, to be put it bluntly, is in a state of perpetual war with Christianity. 9/11 was no accident. It was the logical expression of Islamic jihad against the infidel Christians who have made an "idol" of an Islamic prophet, Jesus.

## **The Christian Lie**

CHRISTIANITY IS THE anti-Logos religion par excellence. In the modern world, it is inconceivable that any intelligent person with a free choice would be a Christian. Christianity is the purest Mythos based on the story that God came to earth, suffered horribly and was killed to save YOU from eternal suffering. What it omits to say that it was God who sentenced you to eternal suffering in the first place over a trivial issue of "disobedience". Had this God been kind, loving, merciful, compassionate and forgiving there would have been no Hell to save you from. He created the problem to which he presented himself as the answer. If he himself hadn't invented the crisis, we would have had no need of him. In other words, the true story of Christianity is that the Christian God needlessly and unforgivably created Hell for humanity – for the very souls which he himself created – and then said that he would save us from the perpetual torture he was happy to inflict on us, but only if we made ourselves his abject slaves and did, at all times, everything he commanded. We would be compelled to continually feed his narcissism by always being on our knees to him, worshipping him.

When you understand the real narrative of Christianity, it loses all its appeal. The aim of Christian propaganda is to ensure that you never hear the true story, only the fake Christian version that tries to put the blame for the world's ills on the created rather than the Creator. Talk about a total abdication of responsibility! The Christian God refuses to be accountable for his own conduct and own work. Everything wrong with the world must be his fault since he created it. If the Creator can't be held responsible then why should the created? Christianity is total nonsense from beginning to end, and it's a shameful and wicked thing for anyone to call themselves a Christian.

"With this I come to a conclusion and pronounce my judgment. I condemn Christianity; I bring against the Christian church the most terrible charge any prosecutor has ever uttered. It is, to me, the extremest thinkable form of corruption, it has had the will to the ultimate corruption conceivably possible. The Christian Church has left nothing untouched by its depravity; it has turned every value into worthlessness, every truth into a lie, and every integrity into baseness of soul. Let no one dare to speak to me of its 'humanitarian' blessings! To abolish any state of distress whatever has been profoundly inexpedient to it; it lives on states of distress; it creates states of distress in order to eternalise itself. . . For example, the worm of sin: it was the Church that first enriched mankind with this state of distress!" -- Nietzsche

Nietzsche has identified the true foundation of Christianity. It CREATED SIN in order to pose as the means for saving us from its own creation. Without Christianity, sin is abolished. We could instead talk of selfishness contrasted with altruism. Rather than "evil", we could talk of unhealthy psychology and psychiatric illness (because ultimately that's what evil is). We could replace priests with psychologists. Wouldn't that bring about a transformed world?

Priests are the most evil people in history because they created the concept of evil in order to have power over others. ("The priest rules through the invention of sin." – Nietzsche.) Only with THEIR help, they proclaimed, could you be saved. Without them, you were damned to eternal suffering.

Priests were psychologists of a most immoral kind. Their interest lay not in curing you of psychological traumas but in manufacturing those traumas: maximising your fears so that you would be in their power. The last thing a priest wants is for people to be psychologically healthy –

because no healthy person needs a priest. Priests deviously and wickedly created the conditions to make themselves necessary. Thus they became powerful. Had priests never existed, humanity would have been infinitely healthier.

All priests who promote the concept of eternal hellfire should be banned. All unhealthy religions should be abolished. Abrahamism is the worst religion of all, the absolute essence of subjecting the human race to TERROR. This Terrorist religion must be obliterated. God is not sick; he is pure health. Only a sick God would create souls in order to torture them in Hell, hence the Abrahamist God is manifestly not God. Only sick people subscribe to Abrahamism.

“No one is free to become a Christian or not to do so: one is not ‘converted’ to Christianity – one must be sufficiently sick for it...” -- Nietzsche

That is Abrahamism in a nutshell. Only the ill, the weak, the pathetic, the sickly, the stupid, the fearful, the superstitious, the irrational, the slaves, the masochists, the self-haters, the very worst specimens of humanity are attracted to it.

So, what are you – sick or healthy?

## **The Norwegian Massacre**

A RIGHT-WING, MASONIC, FUNDAMENTALIST CHRISTIAN bombed Oslo and massacred kids attending a summer camp on an idyllic island.

The killer was turned into a monster by his beliefs, just as Islamic and Jewish Fundamentalists are by theirs. Can we go on allowing this disease, this pathological mental illness of Abrahamism, to be taught to in schools to impressionable young minds?

How many more Abrahamist atrocities must we endure before Abrahamism is declared illegal?

Abrahamism has had 2,000 years to prove its worth and yet it's still steeped in murderous hatred and violence. It has been the most appalling curse on our world. Will we never learn? Isn't it time to declare this criminal religion illegal and save endless innocent lives?

## **The Blameless God**

AFTER THE HOLOCAUST, many Jews asked, “Where was God?” After devastating earthquakes and tsunamis, many people ask, “Where was God?” After the Norwegian massacre, people asked, “Where was God?”

A reasonable enough question, surely.

Now, if you're an apologist for a God of intervention who never intervenes (despite having absolute power to do so), how do you explain away your no-show God?

Easy, you blame humanity!

An Abrahamist in a radio broadcast declared that to ask “Where was God?” is always the wrong question. He suggested an alternative question – “Where was humanity?”

And isn't that such a great tactic? God is *never* to blame for anything. Humanity, on the other hand, is *always* to blame. So, all the Abrahamists can on believing in their blameless God who never raises a finger to help humanity. It's always the nasty, guilty, corrupt, evil, sinful people (created by God, of course – but oops we shouldn't mention that) who are to blame for everything.

Nothing at all can be laid at the door of the Creator, only of the created. What could be more natural than to transfer all the blame from the all-powerful Creator to his powerless Creations? That's the way to go. Never address the cause – blame the symptoms. That's the God of Abrahamism for you. The God who vanishes. The God who is never responsible. But what's the point of this absent God? Hasn't he rendered himself irrelevant? If we're always to blame then who needs God since it's not as if he's ever going to do anything to help us? He and his die-hard supporters have talked him out of the game. In their desperation to absolve him they have made him pointless.

If we're on our own – if God never intervenes and we're always guilty – why don't we just cut “God” out of the equation since he seems totally superfluous? If God is never to blame then neither can he ever be praised. It would be perverse to conclude – as so many Abrahamists do – that all good things are God's work while all bad things are man's work. If we take the blame when things go wrong, we ought to get the credit when things go right. So who needs “God”? He's no longer part of the game of life. He's opted out. The interventionist God who never intervenes is a meaningless God.

After the Holocaust, no Abrahamist could ever think that “God is coming”. We know now that he definitely isn’t. If he didn’t stop the Holocaust, he won’t stop anything, will he? He’s absented himself permanently.

It’s crazy to believe in a God who is never coming. Look to yourself instead. Save yourself. BECOME GOD – then you can intervene on your own behalf. Don’t wait for the Second Coming – *become* the Second Coming.

\*\*\*\*\*

“You’re more of a slave to your beliefs than slaves are to their masters.” -- Anonymous

Nothing is more important than freedom. Freedom is the key to everything. Yet many people loathe freedom. If they can’t find a master to put shackles on them, they shackle themselves. Look at the Jews with their 600+ rules. Each rule is a lovingly crafted link in the slave’s chain. Look at the bowing Muslim masses. Not for one moment do they stand up straight like free people. They are always on their knees, always murmuring their prayers, always bowing to their “God”. “Islam” *means* submission.

Religious beliefs are the ultimate chains for slaves. These are chains that can never be removed. You’re chained every moment of every day, even when you’re asleep.

The ultimate dream of controllers is to get you to internalise their value system. Once you BELIEVE, you are a slave for life. You are so enslaved, you will even sacrifice your life.

It’s the duty of any healthy State to stop its citizens being lured into self-slavery by religion. Self-slavery underpins fanaticism, extremism and intolerance.

When a Muslim suicide bomber “martyrs” himself, it’s the logical and final sacrifice for a slave to make for his master.

All slaves who have embraced their slavery are eager to show that they are the best and most loyal slaves of all. They crave their master’s approval. They will do anything to win it, and that makes them the most dangerous people on earth.

## A New Conspiracy Theory

RECEIVING LOTS OF e-mails is a profoundly depressing experience. For every interesting message there are nine items of unbelievably irritating garbage. Here’s a message from someone calling himself “Adam Smith”.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Hi,**

**I posted at your forum as ‘Ithink’. Your websites are very interesting but I was wondering why they are hosted at Menwith Hill when you (and those you support) are anti ‘Old World Order’?**

**I know the rumors about the Illuminati and Menwith Hill but things are often not that simple.**

**I would appreciate a reply. Thanks.**

**I see you have a yahoo account, would you like a chat through Yahoo messenger?**

**Btw, my name isn’t Adam.**

OUR REPLY: We have no idea where our websites are hosted and nor could we care less. You’ve got a serious problem if you think that “hosting location” is more important than content. You conspiracy theorists are so mad that you make up new conspiracies as you’re going along. You’re actually trying to suggest that we are working for the CIA and are providing misinformation and disinformation. Well, here’s a plan for you. Why don’t you fuck off and then you won’t have to worry about our content?

This world will never change while sad fucks are trying to establish where a website is hosted. Who cares?!

If you think we’re deceiving you, go somewhere else and read something else. It’s THAT simple.

Are we clear?!

\*\*\*\*\*

“Adam” is a classic example of a conspiracy theorist. Sociologist David Riesman defined an “inside-dopester” as a social type whose goal was “never to be taken in by any person, cause or event.”

All conspiracy theorists are inside-dopesters. They have a pathological desire not to be fooled and that, of course, means they are the easiest people on earth to fool – as David Icke and other conspiracy theorist gurus prove every day with the deranged theories they peddle. No sane person could take the proposition of reptilian, shape-shifting Illuminati seriously, yet conspiracy theorists lap it up. They think they’ll be able to spot a reptilian a mile off! No slimy pan-dimensional lizard will ever be taking *them* by surprise!

Try to follow Adam’s thought processes. He stumbles across a website that intrigues him. So far, so good. Then he decides to start tracking the IP address and seeing if he can find out information about it. Is that NORMAL behaviour, or is a sign of incipient paranoid schizophrenia? Remember, no one asked this guy to come to our site. Who in their right mind would start trying to trace a site he has chanced upon? Only a conspiracy theorist thinks that way.

He says our site is hosted at Menwith Hill. This is a Royal Air Force station in the UK which provides communications and intelligence support services to the United Kingdom and the United States of America. According to *Wikipedia*: “The site contains an extensive satellite ground station and is a communications intercept and missile warning site and has been described as the largest electronic monitoring station in the world.”

So now we have a conspiracy theory – an Illuminati site apparently associated with a covert monitoring site of the Anglo-America secret services.

Now, for argument’s sake, let’s just say we were indeed working for the CIA and MI5. Would we be so fucking stupid as to provide a direct trail back to the CIA HQ in Langley, Virginia?

These conspiracy nutters actually believe that by using a few simple internet tools they can identify “black ops” groups who spend millions of dollars on internet security to ensure they can never be traced.

How stupid would you have to be to think you could have any chance at all of identifying CIA units if they didn’t want to be identified?

And this is the problem with inside-dopesters. They think their infantile IP-address look-up exercises allow them to reveal the secrets of the powers that be.

They must think that the world’s intelligence services are incredibly dumb, yet at the same time they’re always accusing the intelligence services of the most elaborate, sophisticated, impenetrable and diabolical conspiracies imaginable – like 9/11.

This is classic doublethink. If the intelligence services are good at what they do you will never know what they are doing. If they’re incompetent then who cares about them since they’re no threat and will be easily rumbled.

Conspiracy theorists simultaneously argue that the powers-that-be are fiendishly clever and yet the likes of David Icke can apparently see right through them with no trouble at all. Isn’t that a fatal contradiction? Why haven’t they bumped off this “genius” who sees so clearly what they are up to? It’s not as though he’s hard to find. He even uses his own name.

Here’s a message from the David Icke site: “In this incredible 4 hour presentation, author and truth-teller David Icke reveals how the human race got into the present global crisis and the keys to getting out. This no-holds-barred examination of the machinations underlying global events and the mechanisms of control used to keep us in fear and confusion, opens our eyes to the truth what is really happening behind the scenes of our reality. This awareness is a necessary step towards our ultimate liberation as a race, as a species, and as residents of Planet Earth – and includes a demolition of Barack Obama before he was even elected that has proved to be absolutely correct.”

Well, it’s good to know that we’re all safe thanks to David Icke, a true hero of our times.

Yeah, right! We’re sick of these clowns who think they know something. They don’t know anything at all. They’re spinning pulp fiction, and the inside-dopesters think they’re learning real information when all they’re really learning is self-delusion. What’s for sure is that they’re putting lots of nice dosh and lolly in the pockets of their “gurus” such as Icke, Makow and Jones.

The truth is they’re out of the loop and they will *always* be out of the loop. Their worst nightmare has come true. They have no inside dope and they are clueless about what’s really going on.

To all those people who are obsessed with looking up IP addresses rather than trying to campaign against the Old World Order, don’t come near us. Think whatever you like about us. In fact, when you think of us, just picture huge, pan-dimensional, shape-shifting lizards that can become invisible at will and you’ll be pretty close to the mark, OK?!

NOW FUCK OFF. WE’RE TOTALLY SICK OF MESSAGES FROM LUNATICS.



We are simply staggered by the amount of mental illness there is in the world if 90% of the people who write to us are anything to judge by. It's profoundly depressing reading the thoughts of scores of mad people every day.

\*\*\*\*\*

To anyone who's actually interested in the truth, our website uses a cheap and nasty website production tool called "Mr Site", and the site is hosted on their servers. We have no control over where they host their servers and nor are we interested in the subject – because we would be deranged inside-dopesters if we actually cared about such things.

The website software in our experience is, frankly, crap: unreliable, unstable, inconsistent when viewed from different browsers and bug-ridden. However, it has the advantage that it's (mostly) easy to use and the content can be altered at any time by any of the three of us who operate the site. Its ease of use marginally outweighs its many problems.

We are a communication cell of the Illuminati. We're not website designers. The Illuminati isn't going to employ an enormous team of coders to create a glossy, whizzy website that reflects all of the shiny, corporate, capitalist values of the likes of Coca Cola. We are ANTI-CORPORATE, for Christ's sake!!!

We have deliberately chosen a rough and ready, primitive look so that everyone can see how easy it is to get an enormous project off the ground for no more than a few dollars. No one can stop you. You don't need corporate funding. Anyone can get anything off the ground extremely easily these days.

With any luck, the vast wealth of the corporates will become irrelevant and they will be swept away by inexpensive start-ups.

Our website is a reflection of our philosophy that the OWO's gatekeepers are becoming increasingly irrelevant. Anyone or any group with ideas, creativity and something to say doesn't need to go to banks and beg for money. You don't need to hire expensive programmers, designers, advertisers, lawyers, managers, executives and public relations experts.

It sickens us that inside-dopesters would rather waste their time on utterly futile exercises of trying to trace our IP address rather than doing something constructive we their lives.

What have the inside-dopesters "proved" – that our site is hosted by "Mr Site" and we use their cheap software for non web-developers. Big Deal! It was never a mystery in the first place. So, does that mean we're frauds, or that we're working for the CIA or MI5? Have the inside-dopesters caught us bang to rights, just as they caught the Reptilians and the 9/11 inside-job team?

God save us from conspiracy theorists! They're just the latest version of Abrahamists, prepared to believe in anything if it makes them feel good.

## **The Movement**

"TOUGHEY" PROVIDED a good description of what "The Movement" ought to be about:

\*\*\*\*\*

I only recently came across the A/C website in January 2011. After studying and finishing it, I saw the reference to the Movement's website and joined around the end of February 2011.

I immediately began to join the forum for discussions regarding Illuminism, activism, Gnosticism, and related topics. After a short period of time, I found myself the brunt of Sophia's flaming on a topic which she found unacceptable. As I recall it was about the subject of HAARP in the science forum.

There was no logic to her rant, frequent misspellings, and improper English. I gathered that English was not her native language, which I can understand on an international site. What was not comprehensible was the immature attitude with which she handled the situation.

What I soon found out was that others like Phantom and Aeons were just as liable to cut off a subject without any explanation. As administrators their job was to regulate the site. I understand that.

I expressed to them that we should encourage people to ask questions, to educate people (as Phantom would say "you mean indoctrinate"), and assist them in their quest to find out about Illuminism.

The attitude expressed to me was akin to: "If they aren't smart enough to get it, they don't belong here." In short, the attitudes expressed by the administrators as a group were dictatorial,

condescending, unenlightening, immature, and as though they stood above other people as giants and that the “unenlightened masses” were cockroaches.

How can you say you are different than the OWO when you act just like they do?

I had private discussions with Ishtari, a member on that site to see if it was me. She expressed the same conclusions that I experienced. You can confirm our experiences with her.

I respect what Phantom especially and the other administrators have done for their site. I am particularly impressed with the library they have amassed. Phantom is obviously extremely intelligent. To use his phraseology, “Each point of knowledge is a thousand points of light linking me with Universal Mind.”

Yes, it’s important to be intelligent and educated, but it doesn’t replace development of maturity and development of the soul.

Their site has devolved into one that they are comfortable with, where they are the masters and they rule over their flock with an iron fist. However, how does that serve Illuminism in the grander scheme of things?

The mission of our website is to attract the seeker: one who has already read the A/C website, and seeks further understanding: to take them from the initiate stage to one of blossoming, learning how to become God. We seek to establish a green house to grow people, like an academy that Pythagoras would be proud of.

There will be those that come there with their own agenda; those that can’t let go of their old ideas; those who are intellectually lazy, or unfit for other reasons. We must separate the wheat from the chaff. However, to abandon or chase away those who might well blossom under such a program, is to waste the purpose for setting up the A/C website: namely to attract and develop others who can help and inspire our mission.

There is no glory in being the king of the hill in a garbage dump, despite the fact that many dictators still follow this methodology. It is much more glorious to see the lights turn on in people’s eyes as they gain understanding. When they understand and adopt the philosophy as their own, putting it into action is the next natural thing to do.

My purpose is not to denigrate the Joomla site. My purpose is to explain the mission for our site and how we are different. It would seem to me that our mission would be more akin to one that is in congruence with the goals of the A/C site. If I am wrong, please correct me.

We look forward to your inspiration and direction as we move forward with the development of our site along the lines of the mission statement attached.

## **Mission Statement**

“THE PURPOSE OF THE MOVEMENT is to provide a vehicle to amplify the message of the Armageddon Conspiracy website; to provide discussions, explanations and amplifications, when questions are asked, and to provide a means of transforming Illuminati principles into meaningful action.

There are many who come to the A/C website and are illumined by its piercing perceptions and insight into the world. They seek guidance from and union with others of like mind. They want to contribute, but don’t know how.

One of the responsibilities of enlightenment is to help carry the torch for those who wish to follow its path. Unfortunately, there seems to be an attitude in some quarters that if people don’t get it, then they aren’t qualified to be one of us.

Part of enlightenment is a transformation of our personal values beyond those of the animal instincts of the Old World Order which we seek to replace: arrogance, greed, selfishness, pettiness, privilege, among others. Part of our intellectual enlightenment is a “chemical wedding” with Nous, the Philosopher’s Stone, the Holy Grail, in which we transform the alchemy of changing lead into gold in our minds and our souls.

While we are all seeking to become God, we are still human and have human failings. But to adopt an attitude of condescension toward other human beings is not enlightenment.

The Bolsheviks took over from the monarchist Romanovs, but they all, Lenin, Stalin, Trotsky, and the rest of their leaders had contempt for the masses; perhaps more so than the Romanovs, and their movement failed. Not because of the pettiness of their goals, but because of the pettiness in their hearts. Their progress was condemned because they were no different than the people they replaced.

For Illuminism to succeed, we need a place for like minds to gather; a process of separating the wheat from the chaff; to become a greenhouse of seedlings of the übermensch; not the physical übermensch envisioned by the genome carpenters, but the spiritual übermensch.

Lastly, when these spiritual übermenschen are full of Gnostic knowledge and had the

chemical wedding of their souls with Nous, their actions are then laser focused on the actions that will transform our world.

We do not expect that the masses will be part of this process. Perhaps only one in a thousand will be capable of becoming the spiritual übermenschen. But the average person is not reading the A/C site, contemplating its explanations, and going to the Movement page looking for a way to be part of this. They are playing video games, watching movies and television, and consumed with the distractions that this world provides.

A person who finds themselves on the A/C site is most likely a seeker. It is our responsibility to help this seeker of the truth by welcoming them, enlightening them, if they so desire, and provide a family with the same ideals as theirs.

We're not here to sell a book or a series of tapes; to create a market for our madness and achieve cheap notoriety in Satan's world. We are here to first change ourselves and then the world.

There should be a forum topic on the Movement website about each topic on the A/C website, where we have a discussion about the topic, explain any misunderstandings, and come to a general understanding of what is being communicated. This will provide an understanding for all who find their way here. Of course, we would certainly welcome enlightenment from the authors of the A/C site so that our understanding is complete.

Another goal is to provide a viral internet presence through postings on blogs, twitter, facebook, and other social media to make people aware of who we are and what we stand for. Only one out of a thousand will stay to find out more, but we don't need an army of mindless idiots. We only need six thousand committed souls. We are looking to become the modern day Knights Templar.

Finally, with enlightenment from those with greater knowledge, this army can be brought to bear on specific action items to further our goals. There is a group called "Anonymous" that hacks into OWO sites for the giggles of it. This is strictly adolescent behavior. What is the use of having the tools of men and use them with the mind of a child? We are not here to entertain ourselves with how smart we are. We are on a mission.

While we welcome all seekers of truth, we are not shy about pointing others the way if their goals are not congruent with ours. We are not running a teenage chat room or detention center. Our goal is an academy that Pythagoras would be proud of.

If you feel that our objectives are also yours please stay, look around, and participate. Our goal is simple. Rather than wait for enlightenment to come to us, we are seeking enlightenment. We are not waiting to stumble upon God, we are seeking to actively grow towards the objective of becoming Gods ourselves so that we may join him: Spiritual übermenschen living on Mt. Olympus."

\*\*\*\*\*

While we support this statement, there are two points we should like to make:

1) "Unfortunately, there seems to be an attitude in some quarters that if people don't get it, then they aren't qualified to be one of us."

While we have no problem at all with genuine seekers of truth coming to the Movement, we do have a major problem with people coming who have ideas that are absolutely contrary to our platform and aims. We must be clear that we cannot tolerate conspiracy theorists. Conspiracy theories are a waste of time – they consume enormous amounts of it in entirely unproductive speculation. If the Movement is not productive then it has no point. It is just a vacuous talking shop for frittering away people's lives. What has David Icke ever achieved? *Nothing*.

### **If the Movement isn't meaningful then it's meaningless.**

2) "But to adopt an attitude of condescension toward other human beings is not enlightenment."

Equally, overindulgence towards those who are far from enlightenment will be counterproductive. No organisation that accepts a wide range of views and talent can ever achieve the necessary focus to accomplish anything.

The Illuminati is an incredibly tight-knit group with almost no divergence in the core attitudes and opinions of its members. Any group that adheres to rational principles should thereby be brought towards convergence by those self-same principles.

If the Movement can't achieve things then it has no purpose. It must be dedicated to becoming something that actively makes a difference and doesn't just talk about it. There are far too many talkers and not nearly enough doers.

The game is all about walking the walk, not talking the talk.

\*\*\*\*\*

Finding people who can make a difference in the world is like panning for gold. A huge amount of detritus has to be sifted before the nuggets are found. Most of the gold comes in small grains, but now and again a great, gleaming 24 carat nugget appears – a world-historic figure who will change everything.

What's it all about? INTELLIGENCE. DISCIPLINE. AMBITION. CAPABILITY. TALENT. DETERMINATION.

Those are the qualities needed. It's not about what the world can do for you. It's about what you can do for the world. So, what *can* you do? Anything?

Those who can, *do*. Those that can't go on forums and discuss conspiracy theories.

**YOU JUST GOT SERVED.**

**IT'S ON.**

**Treachery**

AN ADMINISTRATOR OF THE MOVEMENT – “Sophia” – openly attacked the position of the Illuminati:

“Agree with you. The stance A/C takes is not only naive and contrary to the whole point of scientific enquiry, the establishment of hard facts, it is also detrimental to ‘M’ by putting off many people. Only a fool believes the official conspiracy theory about the central event that has enabled TPTB to rain down a barrage of disgusting legislations upon us, start new wars that since have killed hundred thousand innocent civilians. Only a fool would talk all day about OWO tyranny and then reject the mountain of evidence, that could, if brought to light bring down the very people that are central in this ‘game’. But hey, why would we care, it's not like they murdered and continue to murder people right?” -- Sophia

Two members of this Illuminati cell are PhD scientists. (55% of the Illuminati are educated to PhD level, and two thirds of those are PhD scientists.) Speaking from that perspective, we find it astounding that closed-minded bigots can possibly imagine that their amateur-hour, non-science speculations constitute anything that resembles “scientific enquiry”. Conspiracy theorists don't know anything about science. That's the whole problem. They think that wild, unsupported conjecture is “fact”. They have zero understanding of the scientific method. The only reason we are in a position to criticize science is that so many of us are from highly qualified scientific backgrounds. We have contempt for the kind of scientifically illiterate people who watch YouTube propaganda videos and think they are “fact”. Every single point raised by the conspiracy theorists concerning 9/11 has been explicitly refuted or discredited. The “mountain of evidence” points in a single direction – that Muslim maniacs were responsible for 9/11 using hijacked planes with huge fuel loads that were slammed into buildings in such a way as to fatally damage the structural integrity. The only mystery about 9/11 is why so many non-scientists and non-engineers imagine that their uninformed opinions make them experts on subjects they have never studied and know nothing about.

If you're clueless about relativity theory, quantum mechanics and M-theory, what makes you imagine you have one meaningful thing to say about the science of 9/11? Where are your qualifications? Where's your MERIT?

The whole point of meritocracy is to place those who know what they're talking about in positions of power. The whole point of non-meritocracy is to make every clown imagine they have a valid opinion that ought to be respected. WRONG.

9/11 conspiracy theories represent amateurs thinking they know more than professionals, and it's for exactly the same reason that the world has to endure Abrahamism. Billions of morons

think that ancient books are superior to science, that “belief” beats facts. Conspiracy theorists are believers too, and they convince themselves that anti-scientific junk is “proof”. They trot out a few controversialists from the scientific community to support their claims and they imagine that a maverick’s opinion counts for more than scientific consensus – because all the rest are somehow “in on it”. While it’s certainly true that the scientific establishment can be wrong, there is not one scintilla of evidence to indicate that it got anything wrong regarding 9/11.

Why is that a decade after the most studied event in history, only conspiracy theorists think Muslims weren’t responsible for 9/11? Don’t they realise they’ve become part of a religion that refuses to listen to the mountain of evidence proving them wrong? They’re like the Muslims who believe the Earth is flat because the Koran says so. Being in a “dialogue” with a conspiracy theorist is as futile as trying to get any sense from a Muslim.

Facts are not at issue – they point to exactly where the blame rightly lies – only belief.

\*\*\*\*\*

In a thread on 9/11, “Phantom” said: “My view practically corresponds with the A/C site as I already had a similar opinion before ever finding A/C. I tend to see it from the Law of Necessity; where is the relevance to it in my life? To me, it has no relevance to debate idiotic things and detracts from my time to be spreading the 9/11 “truth” when I could be doing better things with my life and opinions. 1 pop video is approximately 3 minutes long. 300 million people watching it amounts to 900 million minutes altogether, which is 15 million accumulated hours. It takes 10,000 hours of practice to fully master some skill, and it takes about 60 minutes of intelligent social interaction between 2 or more people to birth a new perspective.

“The more knowledge that you have, the more points of contact you have with the divine mind.”  
-- Phantom

\*\*\*\*\*

That’s exactly the type of approach we want to endorse. Why are 9/11 conspiracy theorists wasting so much time on this subject? There’s no mileage in it at all. Everyone knows who carried out 9/11 – 19 Muslims in a martyrdom operation organised by Osama Bin Laden to strike back at the Great Satan America for supporting Zionist Israel and for having infidel army bases in Arab nations. What’s hard to understand? Anyone who rejects the facts is essentially claiming that there is no such phenomenon as Islamic Jihad. Why don’t they try doing some research on the subject? Then they will discover that thousands of Islamic terrorist operations have been carried out all over the world, killing tens of thousands of innocent people. 9/11 was the pinnacle of that campaign. It was a low-tech operation that took America by surprise.

Don’t forget that in 1941 America was practically on a war-footing with Imperial Japan and still managed to be taken totally by surprise at Pearl Harbor. The Japanese used the code TORA, TORA, TORA to signal that they had achieved total surprise. The 9/11 hijackers could just as well have said the same thing. Conspiracy theorists refuse to believe that America is capable of being surprised. Their belief in the infallibility of the authorities is something of a conundrum. If the authorities are so good, their alleged 9/11 inside job would have been flawless, leaving no smoke for the conspiracy theories to interpret as a fire. It’s always the same with the inside-dopesters. They think that everyone is fooled except them, and that makes them the biggest fools of all.

Using Phantom’s calculations, it’s easily possible that more than a TRILLION HOURS of analysis have been devoted to 9/11. Result? – the official version is undented. Look at Watergate. A couple of journalists brought down a President over a fairly trivial event. If an army of millions of conspiracy theorists can’t land a single serious punch on the official version of 9/11 it’s because there’s no target there.

Given what happened with Watergate when the most powerful man in the world was forced to resign over a cover-up, why would people in the White House in 2001 expect to get away with the most heinous act of treason of all time? Just one loose thread would cause the whole alleged conspiracy to unravel. Would YOU take that risk? If you would, you’d be insane. Why would ultra rich people having a great lifestyle risk their lives to engineer a pretext for war against Iraq by slaughtering their own citizens?

The official reason for the war against Iraq was to remove WMD – weapons of mass destruction. Yet no WMD were found. Would the 9/11 conspiracy theorists like to explain why the alleged 9/11 conspirators were so inept that they couldn’t even manage to plant a few WMD?

The credibility and reputation of Bush and Blair were destroyed by the failure to find WMD in Iraq. How could such people have pulled off 9/11 if they couldn't even rustle up a few planted biological and nuclear weapons to justify their war?

\*\*\*\*\*

The Old World Order are guilty of endless crimes against the people. No one needs to label them with crimes they didn't commit when there are so many they DID commit. They have destroyed countless lives with their greed and selfishness. They have destroyed the potential of billions of people.

They only understand one language: power. Their power comes from money. If you want to destroy their power, you must follow the money and take it away from them, and stop them passing it on to their families.

100% inheritance tax is the only way to stop the OWO, yet most of the 9/11 conspiracy theorists would stand utterly opposed to such a tax. That's the real tragedy, and shows how effectively the OWO have brainwashed the masses.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Movement, if it's to be worthwhile, must attract people such as Pho' and Phantom, and repel the sort of people who are full of bile and have nothing to contribute other than dredging up disproved conspiracy theories.

To beat the Old World Order, we need to assemble a group of people who are smarter, more creative, more dynamic, more disciplined and tougher.

People from unprivileged backgrounds who achieve PhDs are MUCH smarter than privileged preppies piling out of Harvard Business School with MBAs and golden tickets to million dollar salaries.

Look at where the "wonder workers" of Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Columbia and Goldman Sachs have led the world – to the brink of economic meltdown. These "geniuses" have failed in every regard. Why? Because their purpose wasn't to create a healthy, stable economy, but to enrich themselves. All economic systems collapse for one reason only: the greed of those running the economy. If you want a rational, predictable economy you have to make it impossible for the greed gang to drive the economy over the cliff in search of higher returns for themselves.

We said the MBA geniuses got it wrong. Of course, that only means in relation to the rest of us. In terms of themselves, they got exactly what they set out to accomplish – enormous personal wealth. They aren't the ones suffering while the economy goes into a death spiral.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Illuminati is a secret society for smart people. We'll be blunt. We don't like stupid people. We don't want to be in their company. We don't want to listen to their bizarre, uninformed theories. We don't want to be around people contaminated with superstition, faith and irrationality. We don't want to hear dumb conspiracy theories.

If we could get on a spaceship and leave the idiots and dunces behind, we would. We would love to colonize a New Earth in space and let the Abrahamists and conspiracy theorists ooze back into the primordial slime whence they came. We, on the other hand, will get on with the project to form the Community of Gods, the Society of the Divine. You can be sure no stupid people will be playing any role in its creation.

Unlike David Icke, we're not running a business. We don't need to court popularity and seek as many new recruits as possible so that we can flog our merchandise to them.

We don't care about alienating people, or making enemies. If we come across as arrogant, so what? Many of us have climbed out of the gutter and achieved astonishing things in our respective fields of expertise. We overcame the odds. We had no silver spoons in our mouths. We had no networks of influential friends and family. We had no privileged education, no access to private tutors and the best schools and teachers.

We clawed our way up from nothing against overwhelming odds. We are determined people, highly confident in our own abilities. We trust each other implicitly. We don't suffer fools gladly and we're not trying to win any popularity contests. All we care about are truth, freedom, and maximising our human potential. We hate those who block our path. We hate everyone who doesn't "get it".

The Old World Order will be undone by the contradictions inherent in how they run the

world. The gap between rich and poor keeps getting wider. Resentment towards the rich is growing at an enormous rate. One day soon, the whole Fools' paradise of the rich will collapse. The people will take back what the rich stole from them.

New leaders will be required for the New Age. Will you be one of them?

\*\*\*\*\*

Did you know that the Norwegian Christian Fundamentalist mass murderer had a vision of society that was even worse than that of the Muslims he hated so much? It's surprising that he wasn't a Muslim himself given that his views were so backward. He spelt out his "utopia" (Hell to everyone else) in his 1,500 page manifesto. He was certainly right that Islam must be stopped and certainly wrong that fascist Christian Fundamentalism was the "solution". He quoted philosopher John Stuart Mill: "One person with a belief is equal to the force of 100,000 who have only interests." We would express it rather differently: "One person who knows what he's doing is equal to the force of a million who don't."

The Old World Order have triumphed over the world using a set of extremely primitive but astoundingly powerful tools. Their implementation of their techniques has become increasingly sophisticated, but at root they're just variations of Pavlovian conditioning. The game is simple – to get the simple masses to absorb and internalise the values of the ruling elite.

The Illuminati reject everything the OWO stand for. We reject their wealth, their nepotism, their cronyism, their "family first" policy, their system of privilege, their use of money to buy advantages denied to others. We reject their morality, their Abrahamist religions of control, their claims to "divine right" to rule. We reject their freedumb and dumbocracy.

Our task is to strip bare the immoral basis of the ruling elite's morality. Nietzsche wrote an astonishing book called *The Genealogy of Morals* where he analysed the evolutionary development of morals from earlier forms. Once morality is seen as something that evolves then its claims to absolute and eternal validity are overthrown.

Perhaps there was a time when it was right and sensible to keep the stupid masses under control by terrifying them out of their wits with what would happen if they disobeyed "God" while promising them the highest reward possible – Paradise – if they obeyed.

That time is over. Now is the time to attack stupidity and educate the people.

Elite groups can wield control only over submissive, stupid, fearful sheeple. To bring elites to an end, it is necessary to revalue all values, reprogram the people, remove the brainwashing to which they've been subjected and to implement systems that produce smart, free, capable, talented, ambitious, independent, autonomous individuals who can see right through any attempts to condition and manipulate them. This new version of humanity would never permit the rise of any privileged elite.

The idea of an elite is inextricably linked with that of God. All that any elite has to do is convince the superstitious masses that God appointed them and that to disobey them is to disobey God himself. The sheeple therefore think that the elite are the legitimate authority, the rightful rulers.

Imagine a Papal election where the College of Cardinals didn't decide who would be Pope, but rather every Catholic in the world was given a vote. Can there be any doubt that "One Catholic One Vote" would result in the end of Catholicism within a single generation? All the mystique would dissolve. The "magic" would vanish. The Wizard of Oz would be totally exposed.

The last thing that any system of authority wants is the involvement of the masses. Imagine an American election where there were no official political parties and anyone could stand. Imagine Congress being full of ordinary men and women from all backgrounds who had managed to win the support of their peers.

Would Congress be recognisable? Absolutely anyone could be President rather than someone funded by Wall Street and in the pocket of lobbyists.

Wouldn't that be REAL democracy? But of course that's what the people must never have. They must always be given the illusion, never the reality.

Only suckers and sheeple play along. Forget 9/11. Campaign for a new political system that makes the Democrats and Republicans ILLEGAL. They're as bad as each other. Let's have hundreds of independent political parties. Let's make it possible for an unrecognised genius without two cents to rub together to become President.

The world is ruled by fantasy, delusion, superstition, irrationality, faith, prejudice and privilege. Isn't it time we started running it rationally, scientifically and fairly?

## Why Islamic Immigration *Must* be Stopped

- 1) All Muslims believe that all infidels are going to Hell. Should the host communities in America, Canada, Europe or Australia accept intolerant immigrants who believe that the hosts are wicked and devilish for rejecting Allah and Mohammed?
- 2) Muslims advocate the genital mutilation of babies. Is this acceptable? Doesn't everyone have the absolute right to have the integrity of their body protected and for nothing to be done to them without their explicit consent?
- 3) All women in Islam are expected to wear hijabs, niqabs, burqas and even gloves. Islamic women in Saudi Arabia are not allowed to drive. Islamic women can be flogged, stoned to death or hanged for adultery or fornication. They're not allowed to have drink or drugs. Their education is typically extremely primitive and their main function is to please their husband, bring up the family, make the dinner and look after the household. Should the West endorse these Stone Age values?
- 4) To allow Muslims into a country immediately lowers the IQ of that country. Muslims reject Darwinism and believe in a flat earth (with six other flat earths stacked beneath it!). They believe that the earth is a stationary flat disc at the centre of creation, and that the sun revolves around it (in a semi-circular orbit!). It's *haram* – forbidden – for any scientist to do any work that contradicts the Koran. In fact, it is considered impossible that the Koran could ever *be* contradicted since it is the infallible Word of God. How can any Western country allow irrational garbage to be brought in and spread around like a "Stupid Virus"?
- 5) Islamic beliefs are an absolute contradiction of Western values.
- 6) Many Muslim immigrants cannot speak the language of the host country and become welfare dependants, typically having large families that the State must pay for.
- 7) Muslims are tradition-directed and cannot fit in with inner- and other-directed Western nations, leading to ghettoization, intolerance and conflict.

What does Islam offer to the West? Nothing positive; nothing but trouble. It's an entirely negative phenomenon. So why allow Islamic immigration? Isn't it time to get real?

The Western powers are now being eclipsed on the world stage. Western hegemony is dying. The sun set long ago on the British Empire, and now the Star of America has faded to a dying ember.

How can a country stop a death spiral? The UK, far from saving itself, swallowed poison and killed itself. From being the centre of world events in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century, the UK is now a joke on the margins. It has no identity. No one in the UK knows what the UK is or what it stands for.

The central reason for that is multiculturalism. Whereas America expected new citizens to integrate with the American way of life, the UK allowed people to come to the country who couldn't speak English, had no interest in British culture and history but were instead obsessed with the culture and history of the countries from which they had come, who made no attempt to integrate and eagerly embarked on projects to create miniature versions, often of a more extreme nature, of from where they had emigrated. They created ghettos for themselves. Above all, they clung to their home religions (Islam in particular) that were utterly alien to the British way of life. It seemed that the only reason they had come to the UK was to benefit from the British welfare system. They kept taking, and never giving. They made no contribution to the UK at all. They lived out their lives in strange ghettos never visited by the mainstream UK population.

It's possible to go to parts of the UK where, if you woke up in those places, you would be



certain you had been abducted and shipped to another nation. You would detect no signs of the UK. You would hear foreign tongues, see shops selling foreign food, see people dressed in foreign clothes, see foreign people going to foreign places of foreign religious worship. This process is now happening all over Europe, and everyone is becoming extremely nervous about it. Something must give, and the Norwegian massacre was the first act of a long Immigration War that will engulf us all. The Norwegian killer had nothing positive to offer. His vision of how Europe should be was as grim as that of the Muslims. Nevertheless, he has fired the first volley and many more will surely follow because this is the central issue of our time.

The UK has lost its identity. It has become a patchwork of foreign mini-countries that can't communicate. Political correctness is rife. The truth is never heard and never allowed to be heard. No one is allowed to call to account Muslims, Jews or the Royal Family. All controversial debates are suppressed. Everything has been replaced with Celebrity Culture, Reality TV and the salaciousness, prurience and sleaze of tabloid newspapers. The UK has become a joke, an insult to its former self.

The people of Britain don't know who they are, and they are therefore certain to perish. They have no values. They don't stand for anything. They have killed themselves by taking the cyanide pill of multiculturalism. Given current trends, it would certainly be possible to imagine the UK being an Islamic kingdom by the end of this century.

Since the UK has no identity, others, those who are stronger and more determined, will impose their identity on the British. There will be no resistance since resistance is possible only for those who have values.

Holland is even closer to cultural meltdown than the UK, and Germany is beginning to slide down the pole.

To the extent that the world has produced high values worth preserving, nearly all of them have originated in the West. It will be a catastrophe of inconceivable proportions if the value systems of the Arabs and Jews are allowed to triumph. Those are the Devil's own values.

In the Monty Python film *The Life of Brian* – a movie that nearly made Christian Fundamentalists detonate – Jewish revolutionaries discussed what the Romans had ever done for Judea. They soon formulated an extremely long list!

We would like the question – “What have the Xs ever done for us?” – to be made into the central question of immigration policy.

What have the MUSLIMS ever done for us? In positive terms, NOTHING! On the negative side, they have given us extremism, terrorism, fanaticism, 9/11, the Madrid Bombings, the London Bombings, burqas, niqabs, and hijabs, sinister old men with beards, fatwas, suicide bombings, intolerance, ghettoization, cultural apartheid, book burnings, hysterical demonstrations, death threats against cartoonists, assassinations of book translators. They have given us irrationality, faith, superstition and absolute hatred of reason. They have proclaimed a truly absurd and disproven book – the Koran – as the Word of God. Is there a single sentence in the Koran that can be considered true? NOT ONE. If God authored the Koran then he is a retard and therefore NOT GOD. The Koran is a monumental lie.

Imagine if the Koran had spoken of galaxies, of black holes, of supernovas, of atoms and quantum mechanics and relativity theory. Who could have doubted the Koran for one second if this book from seventh century Arabia had described a universe unimaginable to any Arab? But the Koran contains not one scientifically accurate statement. It concentrates on camels and goats and wiping your ass with your left hand. Is that the best GOD can do? What paucity of the imagination, what retardation of the intellect would you have to suffer from to imagine that God, the Creator of All, couldn't give humanity something rather better than the Koran? Does any Muslim have any explanation for why virtually everyone who is not raised as a Muslim – hence not the victim of Islamic brainwashing – finds the Koran comical and ludicrous? How could the Word of God be held in contempt if it were genuinely God's Word? Wouldn't the real God's words have a numinous, infallible quality that could not but persuade everyone who came across them? The Koran has no such quality. Instead, it sounds exactly like the ramblings of a seventh century Arabian man suffering from multiple psychiatric conditions.

If Muslims have any regard for the truth at all, they must turn to the True God, Abraxas, and save themselves from the religion of a mad disciple of the Devil. Science has spoken. Islam is false in every regard. The debate is over. The facts are unarguable.

And just as the Koran should be utterly condemned, so should the Torah and Bible, for exactly the same reasons. They have been explicitly refuted by science. Only the insane would continue to place any faith in them. If reason and education mean anything at all then they mean that all nations should now openly declare the texts of Abrahamism to be false. They should no longer be taught in schools and they should be shunted permanently off to the private sphere

where they will hopefully curl up and die. They should be given no place at all in the public sphere. They are vehicles of irrationality, superstition and anti-science.

The West, if it wants to save itself, must return to the glorious example of paganism. The ancient Greeks – the great dreamers, thinkers and visionaries – were almost divine such was their intellectual and cultural magnificence. The Romans were the geniuses of all things practical. They were engineering and military experts. They were ultra tough, disciplined, and determined. They sought ways to overcome every problem.

What we need is a New West, a perfect blend of the complementary strengths of the ancient Greeks and Romans. Then the West will prosper as never before and lead the world into a glorious new age when human potential is finally unleashed to its maximum extent, when humanity, like Prometheus, is UNBOUND.

The hour is late, but it's not yet too late for the West to save itself. But first it must know itself and know what it is not. It must have an identity, and that identity must be one that is hostile to Middle Eastern Abrahamism, the great toxin in the blood supply of the West. It's amazing it hasn't killed us yet, but it's getting closer and closer to the heart, and then it will prove fatal.

For any immigrant to be admitted to the West, they must be able to show that they will do something positive, not be a Trojan Horse, destroying us from within.

## **Lady Gaga: is She or isn't She?**

WE WERE SENT THIS MESSAGE:

\*\*\*\*\*

A mentally brainwashed girl : <http://youtube/gNGExNhLYD4>

Lady Gaga "Judas" video: <http://youtube/wagn8Wrmzuc>

And this website, although it interprets correctly many of the occult videos, they blame, of course, the real Illuminati for everything (the owner of the portal has Phoenician ancestry):

<http://vigilantcitizen.com/>

<http://vigilantcitizen.com/musicbusiness/lady-gagas-judas-and-the-age-of-horus/>

Now, Lady Gaga, at first glance might be:

1. A real Illuminati member trying to wake people up.
2. An OWO propaganda slave who acts against the real Illuminati (by pretending to be an Illuminati member & using occult symbols/ themes).
3. Just an artist with good music producers and good fashion taste trying to make \$\$.

Any hint is welcomed.  
Have a nice day.

\*\*\*\*\*

Our Reply:

It's our long-standing policy not to comment on who may or may not be a current member of the Illuminati (although, logically, anyone we attack and denounce in our articles is plainly being identified as a non-member). In fact, we don't comment on anyone who has been a member since 1950. If we kept saying who *wasn't* a member then anyone about whom we refused to comment would then be inadvertently exposed.

However, we will pose the question whether it's plausible, given the stance of our website, to make any connection between someone such as Lady Gaga and the real Illuminati. As for the mythical Illuminati that conspiracy theorists write about, well anything's possible since there's no such Illuminati: it's a figment of these people's imaginations, fuelled by the misinformation and disinformation of the OWO and conspiracy theorists trying to make money from the naive and gullible.

## **Toxic Brands**

THE "ILLUMINATI" IS OF COURSE a toxic brand. But, if you think about it, all brands are toxic to those who don't buy into them. Microsoft, Google, Apple, Coca Cola, Facebook, Lady Gaga, "William and Kate" (of the English royal family)....they are all toxic to those who aren't fans of these organisations or people.

Scientology is a toxic religious brand, so is Mormonism, the Jehovah's Witnesses, Seventh Day Adventists, Pentecostals etc.

Judaism is a phenomenally toxic brand. Catholicism is toxic. Protestantism is toxic. No one in the West would want to be a Muslim – the most toxic brand in the world right now.

Bankers are toxic. Freemasons are toxic. Celebrities are toxic. Politicians are toxic. The media are toxic. Advertisers are toxic.

So, there's nothing unique about the Illuminati's toxicity. All brands create friends and foes. Friends applaud the brand, foes condemn it. So it goes.

It's not toxicity itself that's the problem for the Illuminati. Rather, it's the refusal of anyone to even countenance listening to the Illuminati. That's because the Illuminati are inextricably linked to conspiracy theories – another totally toxic brand for anyone not interested in conspiracy theories.

That's why the Illuminati almost never operate in the name of the Illuminati. In fact, our A/C website is the only place in recent history in which the Illuminati have openly stated their position. This was done, partly, as an experiment to gauge what effect the internet, social networking and crowdsourcing might have on the success of our message. These are all radically new aspects of society and it was possible that the Illuminati's message might have captured the Zeitgeist and taken off. But now the evidence is in and the website has been a dismal failure in relation to its public impact and has done nothing at all to repair the Illuminati brand and communicate our message. So it goes.

The world is much dumber than we had thought, and, it must be said, we started with a low opinion of the capabilities of the average person. Humanity is well and truly in the thrall of the dumbing-down, lowest common denominator culture promoted by Abrahamism and capitalism. The spirituality of humanity has, more or less, arrived at the flatline stage. IT'S DEAD!

Despite that, we still consider that the dynamic of world forces is heading our way. Faith in the institutions of the world is rapidly collapsing, but there's no prominent alternative vision at the moment. Eventually, our vision will be the only one left standing because all of the others will be discredited. It's rather depressing that the LAST vision to be tried by the human race will prove to be the correct one. But that's humanity for you. In the end, it was inevitable that it would see the light only at the very end. Humanity didn't get to where it is today by being the smartest kid in the cosmos. Instead it was the dumbest, practically retarded. It was only a tiny proportion of the human race – the thinkers and intuitives – who dragged the rest out of the primordial swamps and caves.

Humanity owes EVERYTHING to a few heroes. Without them, we would be indistinguishable from apes. We are technically the "Fifth Ape" and only the intelligentsia have elevated us to the position where some of us stand on the threshold of gnosis and divinity.

## **The Toxic Brand II**

BECAUSE THE ILLUMINATI is a toxic brand, we have to use other brands to act as proxies for the Illuminati. People who take an interest in the proxies will be exposed to similar ideas to those of the Illuminati, but won't realise there's any connection.

One person whose views are very close to those of the Illuminati is Pierre Teilhard. This Jesuit priest's views were regarded as so heretical that he was forbidden from publishing his writings during his lifetime. Anyone who takes an interest in Teilhard will sooner or later find their way to us, as a more logical, anti-Christian version of his evolutionary cosmic system.

Teilhard's key ideas were 1) "the Noosphere" and 2) the "Omega Point".

Teilhard said that Earth started out as a "dead" planet (geosphere) then evolved a living layer

(biosphere) in which human beings evolved and added a new layer of consciousness (the noosphere). This can be imagined as an invisible atmosphere of mind above the biosphere which people mentally “breathe”. Teilhard said that the noosphere would evolve and its effect would be to create a kind of Mass Mind, a Collective Consciousness. We would all be able to tune into each other’s thoughts in some sense. If we could all tune into the suffering and injustices experienced by others, if we could literally feel their pain, we would stop treating each other badly, wouldn’t we? If each of us felt the pain we inflicted on others, we would stop doing it – because none of us wants to cause ourselves pain.

In effect, the noosphere crystallizes the Golden Rule – “Do unto others as you have them do unto you.” The noosphere promotes greater love, understanding, sympathy, empathy, peace, justice, morality, decency and community. What’s not to like? In a world of the evolving noosphere, peace and justice would start breaking out everywhere!

The internet is sometimes said to be a reflection of the evolving noosphere, linking the consciousness of everyone on the planet. Facebook is a kind of tool of the noosphere.

If narcissistic celebrities were given the chance to talk about the noosphere, they would be seen to be smart and up-to-date with the internet; they could talk intelligently about peace and justice without mouthing platitudes, and they would secretly and unknowingly be promoting a message favourable to the Illuminati. And thus dumb celebrities could unwittingly be drawn into our orbit – our celebrity Death Star, fatal to celebrity culture!

Teilhard’s second idea – the Omega Point – is a way of talking about an abstract version of God. The Omega Point is drawing the noosphere towards it and eventually the two will merge, which will be tantamount to human beings entering into a union with God. This is similar to the Illuminist concept of “becoming God”.

So, Teilhard provides a relatively uncontroversial version of Illuminist ideas and serves as a highly useful proxy. If you want to steer people towards the Illuminati without mentioning the Illuminati, use Teilhard as your access “drug”. Even those who reject his ideas nevertheless find them fascinating.

\*\*\*\*\*

Ours is the only cell of the Illuminati that explicitly refers to itself as the Illuminati and that’s because we are tasked with putting the record straight and setting out the true agenda of the Illuminati rather than all the fabricated nonsense that conspiracy theorists talk about. Adam Weishaupt, the most notorious Grand Master of the Illuminati, was intent on overthrowing monarchies and religions of faith. That is STILL the agenda of the Illuminati, although monarchies have been largely replaced by privileged elites.

If any conspiracy theorists had ever bothered to study the facts, they would have realised that the Illuminati were never doing anything other than promoting the agenda of the Enlightenment, and that remains true to the present day. Of course “truth” and “conspiracy theorists” are two terms that rarely belong in the same sentence. The Movement, supposedly aligned with our aims, is full of naïve conspiracy theorists still banging the ludicrous 9/11 drum that the very rich members of the Bush Government, enjoying luxury lifestyles, decided to commit high treason and declare war on their own people and nation, thus risking being executed if just ONE thing went wrong with their plot, and entering history as the most infamous Americans of all time. Their families would be permanently disgraced and lose all their wealth and power. What conceivable reason would any rich, powerful politician have to jeopardise everything in order to attack Iraq, a country that wasn’t even implicated in 9/11? That’s some plan where you seek to engineer an excuse for waging war on Iraq and you don’t even put Iraqis in the frame as the alleged terrorists – are these conspirators the dumbest fucks ever?

Numerous retarded members of The Movement (including administrators!) would prefer to believe this insane scenario rather than the obvious truth that fanatical Islamic jihadists – who despise America and its support for Zionism – hijacked four planes and slammed them into buildings. Out of 450 members of the Movement, we would regard over half of them as being actively harmful to our aims! Somehow they arrived at the wrong site. They should be on the David Icke forum with all the rest of the nutters who believe in pan-dimensional, shape-shifting reptilians.

The Movement should start to consider abolishing itself if it is incapable of rational analysis of the world. Anyone who believes that the American government was responsible for 9/11 rather than Muslim madmen should FUCK OFF! We don’t want to be associated with stupid and naïve people who keep adding two and two and getting five.

9/11 is the most heavily analysed event in human history. Millions of people have spent a

decade trying to prove it was an inside job. Millions more have taken it upon themselves to debunk the conspiracy theories. Not one shred of credible evidence has ever implicated the American government while a staggeringly enormous amount has shown that it was carried out by Islamic jihadists. Virtually every step they took has been tracked.

Those who say that 9/11 was an inside job are also, in effect, saying that the Madrid bombings were carried out by the Spanish government and the London bombings by the British government. In fact, they are essentially saying that all the thousands of acts of Islamic terrorism around the world were all faked by governments intent on blaming Islam for everything. The many thousands of Muslim “martyrs” who have killed themselves in suicide bombings all over the world are actually government agents (!). Islam, so the 9/11 Truthers think, is entirely harmless and benign and Muslims have been wickedly picked on by a cabal of evil Western governments intent on creating a fiction of Islamic Terrorism in order to justify a “War on Terror” that allows governments to attack the freedoms of their citizens and spy on them all, while conquering Islamic nations for their oil in order to make the super rich even richer. That’s the analysis of people such as the Movement’s “Sophia”.

What a joke. Why don’t you try reading the Koran rather than conspiracy theories? Anyone who thinks Islam is benevolent obviously knows nothing about Islam and has never met any Muslims.

The 9/11 conspiracy theory is a faith-based religion. No matter how much it’s refuted, the believers cling to the deranged ideas. They brand those who don’t agree with them as “infidels” – stooges of the government, naïve and stupid, unable to see reality. In fact, all of those things are true of themselves. They are projecting their own deficiencies onto others. They have a huge amount in common with Muslims – which is obviously why they are so well-disposed towards Islamic terrorists.

The 9/11 conspiracy theory is extremely attractive to the sort of people who also believe in the hollow Earth, Nibiru and pan-dimensional reptilian Illuminati! Who in their right mind would want to be in that company?

9/11 stands as a proxy for right-wingers, libertarians and anarchists to attack the concept of government. Every time they raise the 9/11 canard, they are actually proclaiming their hatred of government. Their logic runs like this: governments are a lethal threat to their own citizens – as “proved” by 9/11 – therefore let’s overthrow governments and introduce free markets, libertarianism and anarchy.

We, the Illuminati, are opposed to bad and corrupt government, but we are absolute defenders of government per se. This world will be plunged into utter chaos and war if the free-marketeers, libertarians and anarchists come to power. The only way forward is for humanity to turn to meritocratic government – whereby a nation’s most talented individuals run the country and they are elected by their peers in their particular sphere of expertise and can be removed by those peers if they do not prove up to the task. A central feature of meritocratic government is to prevent anyone from becoming too rich and powerful, and to impose 100% inheritance tax on everyone to explicitly prevent the formation of dynastic family elites. Good government is what humanity needs, not constant attacks on the legitimacy of government. Every attack on the “Big State” is a coded attack on government, and is overwhelmingly associated with extreme right wingers.

We have been deeply saddened by how many members of the Movement are actually right-wing fanatics who don’t recognise themselves as such. They are in denial. Nearly all 9/11 “Truthers” are right wing nutcases with a toxic hatred of government. We despise these lunatic right-wingers with their deranged hatred of government.

It’s now time for the Movement to discuss its own existence. If it’s incapable of being anything other than a forum for unbelievably stupid people advancing David Icke style arguments then it ought to crawl under a stone and have the good grace to die. We feel sorry for the smart people who have found their way to The Movement only to discover themselves surrounded by the undisciplined, self-indulgent ranters with nothing positive to contribute. Pho’, one of the genuine shining lights of the Movement, expressed extreme disillusionment with how it was progressing. We couldn’t contradict his view since he was saying exactly what we thought.

If the Movement can’t become a gathering point for smart, creative radicals who want to seriously change the world for the better then it’s a waste of time and no better than David Icke’s crazy gang. If it can’t become infinitely better than it currently is then we renounce it and denounce it as an abomination.

We have been informed that we are regularly bad-mouthed by “Sophia” and we have been presented with the necessary evidence. Well, Sophia, it’s time for you to go elsewhere. You are *persona non grata*. Do the decent thing and go and make friends with David Icke. You’ll feel a lot more at home with his reptilian-Illuminati world view.

Conspiracy theories are the road to nowhere. They are for stupid people, with mental health issues, who have nothing better to do with their time. If you want a new world then work for a meritocratic government of the smartest, most creative and talented people in your nation. That's the only way the world will change.

We will remove the link to the Movement from our home page. We were intending to replace it with another site until the author of that site said we should be supporting the "genius" Muhammad al-Gaddafi!

Either we are extremely poor at communication, or we are dealing with legions of people who are just incapable of "getting it". Given our hatred of Islam, of dictators, or repressive regimes, of totally corrupt individuals, of nepotism and cronyism, what possible reason could anyone have for suspecting that we are secret allies or advocates of Gaddafi?

Gaddafi has oppressed his people for decades. He has never once held any election that could result in his downfall, and refuses to hold an election now. At least half of his country is in open war against him, and many of the rest would join the uprising if they weren't surrounded by Gaddafi's brutal enforcers. Gaddafi's power base is his tribe, upon which he has lavished gifts and prosperity – while everyone else had to suffer deprivation.

His is just about the most horrific, anti-meritocratic regime imaginable. It is based on privilege, tribalism (caste system), nepotism, and cronyism. Gaddafi's sons are notorious playboys and international globetrotters, spending their father's billions of oil dollars in a mad splurge of self-indulgence. Like all tyrants, Gaddafi appoints people on the basis of their allegiance to him, not their merit.

Gaddafi's "Green Book" containing his "philosophy" is an infantile, meandering exploration of the bizarre thoughts of a power-crazed madman trying to pretend he represents the interests of his people.

It was suggested by our correspondent that NATO are evil and, because they are attacking Gaddafi, he is therefore good. Of course, the reality is that NATO and Gaddafi are both an abomination and the more damage they can do to each other, the better it suits us.

How is it possible that someone who claims to support our aims could send us an email asking us to join with him in expressing his admiration for Gaddafi? Has the world gone stark, staring mad?

The only good Muslim, like the only good Jew, is one who has totally repudiated the Torture God. The idea that we would ever endorse a follower of Allah is beyond belief. It's impossible for us to comprehend how anyone could have written to us suggesting such a thing, especially when the Muslim in question is a brutal tyrant despised by his oppressed people. We find it profoundly disturbing that individuals, having read our site, can then write to us expecting us to endorse positions that we have explicitly condemned.

We reject Islam in every conceivable way. We reject tyrants. We reject nepotism and cronyism. We reject tribalism. We reject leaders plundering their nations. Gaddafi is guilty of every one of these crimes, yet someone thinks this person is admirable.

We don't mind debate and a variety of opinions, but we will have nothing to do with those who support the precise opposite of what we stand for. It is madness for anyone to write to us expressing support for a notorious Muslim. We know we are failing to communicate our message if we attract the sort of people who support 9/11 conspiracy theories on the one hand, or Muslim dictators on the other.

We created the Freemasons and they became an abomination. We won't make the same mistake again.

So, the Movement is no more.

If any rational, sensible people want to try establishing a new incarnation of the Movement, we're happy to listen to good ideas. But, to reiterate, we don't want to have any dealings at all with supporters of conspiracy theories or Islamic tyrants. The only people we want to hear from are those interested in politics, science, mathematics, philosophy, technology, engineering, sociology, art, activism and creativity. No ill-disciplined bellyachers banging on endlessly about their favourite conspiracy obsession are welcome. Waste your life somewhere else. Get out of our way. The New Movement is for a New Elite Humanity, of those from non-privileged backgrounds who want to work meaningfully towards replacing the Old World Order. If you're not smart, energetic and creative, you certainly won't be part of the new ruling order. We are the Party of Meritocracy, so if you're not a person of merit, don't expect any favours from us.

If you want an example of a member of the Movement who has consistently upheld the type of thinking, approach and attitude that we consider could lead to great outcomes, it's "Phantom". He has just turned twenty yet seems much more mature and grounded than many people twice his age who write to us.

He is working on a “Philosophy of Achievement” and another project called *Heliopolis* about what an ideal, high-tech city-state would look like. He is about to embark on a civil engineering degree, followed by architecture.

It’s that type of person who will change things, not supporters of Gaddafi or 9/11 obsessives. Engage your brains before you write to us. Do you think the heirs of Pythagoras and Leibniz want to read that Gaddafi is a “genius” or that we should spend our time on conspiracy theory nonsense about Reptilians or rich Americans killing their own citizens for oil? No, we want to hear from people who can create new cities, new technologies, new art, new societies, new political parties, new religions, new economic systems, new ideas, new psychological theories, new education systems, new philosophies. Our aim is to REVALUE ALL VALUES. We have no interest at all in people who have nothing to contribute to a New World Order.

Conspiracy theorists have nothing to contribute. Compare David Icke’s site with ours. Is any comparison actually possible? If you want to spend your time in insane speculation, he’s the man for you. You won’t catch him or any of his “followers” trying to design a new society based on meritocracy. All they ever do is whinge and whine and invent conspiracies to keep their tiny brains occupied while they wait for the arrival of the Reptilian Illuminati from Nibiru (or the Hollow Earth, depending on preference).

The time for bullshit is over. It’s time to get real. If you have nothing to contribute then it’s time to face *Ronnie Real*, the man who punctures all fantasies and self-delusion. Stop kidding yourself. Don’t pretend to be something you’re not. Do you think the authors of the A/C site are lazy, dumb assholes who read about conspiracy theories all day long? The only conspiracy we’re interested in is the one that involves the world freeing itself of privileged elites and mad religions. Many members of the Movement have demonstrated that they’re clueless and talentless wannabes. How can you expect to be taken seriously? You’re a joke, but no one’s laughing. People of the calibre of Pho’ have been all but lost to the Movement because, as Pho’ put it so vividly, he felt as though he was “pissing in the wind.” Exactly so.

The Movement must be capable of generating momentum. The current Movement staggers along like a cripple, attracting some new sad soul every two days or so. It needs to be put out of its misery. In truth, it’s already dead. In internet terms, it was never alive. YouTube videos of dogs walking on their hind legs get more hits in a day than the Movement does in year. If there are no world-historic figures capable of turning the Movement into something meaningful that interests people, too bad. We tried, but there were no fish to catch. We can’t be blamed for the empty rivers and seas.

This is the Wake Up call. This is the reading of the Riot Act. The time for amateur hour is well and truly over. As Pho’ said, it’s all about DISCIPLINE. If a group cannot be a disciplined group with a common objective and the talent to make real things happen in the real world then it’s just a pointless talking shop for abject losers. We don’t want to have any connection with sad losers who still think that American citizens placed detonation charges in the Twin Towers (and surrounding towers), fired a missile at the Pentagon and shot down the fourth hijacked plane for no apparent reason (since surely the diabolical conspirators would have wanted the plane to hit its designated target). Were the planes remote controlled with no people on board? Were there no hijackers? Was it all faked, like the Moon Landing (!!)? WHAT THE FUCK!!! How dumb and warped would you have to be to believe that shit?

The American government was appalling under Bush and just as bad under Obama. Blame it for its track record of total incompetence. Don’t make up reasons for hating it. Anyone who says that Bush was responsible for 9/11 is in effect an ally of Islamic Jihad. Let’s get this on the record once and for all. The greatest danger of all to our world is not the Old World Order – it’s ISLAM. You think the anti-Terror measures taken by Western governments are oppressive? – well try living under Sharia Law, with every woman veiled, every man bearded, and with moral “police” everywhere clamping down on alcohol, drugs, sex and rock ‘n’ roll – then you’ll find out what oppression really is. Grow up. Stop being naïve. Stop blaming your government for everything. Open your eyes. We don’t live in a world where it’s the OWO versus the rest. Islam is not an OWO entity in the same way as the elite dynastic families of the capitalist West. The people of the world don’t have a unipolar enemy. The enemies are multipolar: the OWO, Abrahamists and conspiracy theorists.

It reveals how sinister our world is that the vanguard of reason and light – the Illuminati – have been depicted as evil puppetmasters while the actual evil puppetmasters have been allowed to rule the world virtually unopposed. You get people who call themselves Christians and who vote for the privileged, rich Republican Party and watch Rupert Murdoch’s Fox News, denouncing the “conspiracy” of the Illuminati. In fact, Christianity is a conspiracy against the interests of the people, the Republican Party is a conspiracy on behalf of the rich elite and Fox

News spouts out on a 24/7 basis the propaganda of the ruling elite and their ideology of diverting more and more money to the rich in the name of freedumb, dumbocracy and the “small State”.

The people who call themselves conspiracy theorists have already succumbed completely to those conspiring against them and have instead decided that those who seek to liberate them are the true conspirators. That’s how brilliantly the Old World Order have manipulated the masses. They have made the people think that their one escape route has been designed by evil puppetmasters, so now the people have no wish to escape. They stay in jail voluntarily. When you can get people to do that to themselves, you’ve got it made.

The best examples of the self-imprisoning mind are provided by Jews, Muslims and, ironically, conspiracy theorists who have locked themselves into a view of the world where they take no personal responsibility and blame everything on the “government”.

To all American conspiracy theorists we say this: if you genuinely believe that your government killed 3,000 of you on 9/11 then you are in a State of War with Washington D.C. So why aren’t you on the streets with your guns, fighting back? Are you sheep waiting to be slaughtered?

The reason you’re not on the streets is that deep down you know as well as we do that 19 Muslims suicide hijackers looking for martyrdom like tens of thousands of other Jihadists were the perpetrators of 9/11. Why don’t you get honest with yourselves for once in your lives? Blame the government for its actual crimes against the people, not imaginary ones.

\*\*\*\*\*

“AI” sent us the following dialogue with a Muslim:

**I recently made an account on YouTube and was sent a message by this guy: 2009abuabdullah. It reads:**

Proving the Existence of Allah to an Intelligent Atheist (i.e. sincere atheist) –

A MUST READ

Hard questions for an atheist!

1. were you created by nothing or did you create yourself?
2. what’s the purpose of life?
3. Apart from scientific evidence, what else would make you acknowledge the existence of God Almighty?

Proving the Existence of Allah to an Intelligent Atheist (i.e. sincere atheist) by Dr. Zakir Naik

CONGRATULATING AN ATHEIST

Normally, when I meet an atheist, the first thing I like to do is to congratulate him and say, “My special congratulations to you”, because most of the people who believe in God are doing blind belief – he is a Christian, because his father is a Christian; he is a Hindu, because his father is a Hindu; the majority of the people in the world are blindly following the religion of their fathers. An atheist, on the other hand, even though he may belong to a religious family, uses his intellect to deny the existence of God; whatever concept or qualities of God he may have learnt in his religion may not seem to be logical to him.

My Muslim brothers may question me, “Zakir, why are you congratulating an atheist?” The reason that I am congratulating an atheist is because he agrees with the first part of the Shahada i.e. the Islamic Creed, ‘La ilaaha’ - meaning ‘there is no God’. So half my job is already done; now the only part left is ‘il lallah’ i.e. ‘BUT ALLAH’ which I shall do Insha Allah. With others (who are not atheists) I have to first remove from their minds the wrong concept of God they may have and then put the correct concept of one true God.

LOGICAL CONCEPT OF GOD



My first question to the atheist will be: "What is the definition of God?" For a person to say there is no God, he should know what is the meaning of God. If I hold a book and say that 'this is a pen', for the opposite person to say, 'it is not a pen', he should know what is the definition of a pen, even if he does not know nor is able to recognise or identify the object I am holding in my hand. For him to say this is not a pen, he should at least know what a pen means. Similarly for an atheist to say 'there is no God', he should at least know the concept of God. His concept of God would be derived from the surroundings in which he lives. The god that a large number of people worship has got human qualities – therefore he does not believe in such a god. Similarly a Muslim too does not and should not believe in such false gods.

If a non-Muslim believes that Islam is a merciless religion with something to do with terrorism; a religion which does not give rights to women; a religion which contradicts science; in his limited sense that non-Muslim is correct to reject such Islam. The problem is he has a wrong picture of Islam. Even I reject such a false picture of Islam, but at the same time, it becomes my duty as a Muslim to present the correct picture of Islam to that non-Muslim i.e. Islam is a merciful religion, it gives equal rights to the women, it is not incompatible with logic, reason and science; if I present the correct facts about Islam, that non-Muslim may Inshallah accept Islam.

Similarly the atheist rejects the false gods and the duty of every Muslim is to present the correct concept of God which he shall Insha Allah not refuse. (You may refer to my article, 'Concept of God in Islam', for more details.)

## **QUR'AN AND MODERN SCIENCE**

The methods of proving the existence of God with usage of the material provided in the 'Concept of God in Islam' to an atheist may satisfy some but not all.

Many atheists demand a scientific proof for the existence of God. I agree that today is the age of science and technology. Let us use scientific knowledge to kill two birds with one stone, i.e. to prove the existence of God and simultaneously prove that the Qur'an is a revelation of God.

If a new object or a machine, which no one in the world has ever seen or heard of before, is shown to an atheist or any person and then a question is asked, "Who is the first person who will be able to provide details of the mechanism of this unknown object? After little bit of thinking, he will reply, 'the creator of that object.' Some may say 'the producer' while others may say 'the manufacturer.' Whatever answer the person gives, keep it in your mind, the answer will always be either the creator, the producer, the manufacturer or somewhat of the same meaning, i.e. the person who has made it or created it. Don't grapple with words, whatever answer he gives, the meaning will be same, therefore accept it.

SCIENTIFIC FACTS MENTIONED IN THE QUR'AN: for details on this subject please refer to my book, 'THE QUR'AN AND MODERN SCIENCE -- COMPATIBLE OR INCOMPATIBLE?'

## **THEORY OF PROBABILITY**

In mathematics there is a theory known as 'Theory of Probability'. If you have two options, out of which one is right, and one is wrong, the chances that you will chose the right one is half, i.e. one out of the two will be correct. You have 50% chances of being correct. Similarly if you toss a coin the chances that your guess will be correct is 50% (1 out of 2) i.e.  $1/2$ . If you toss a coin the second time, the chances that you will be correct in the second toss is again 50% i.e. half. But the chances that you will be correct in both the tosses is half multiplied by half ( $1/2 \times 1/2$ ) which is equal to  $1/4$  i.e. 50% of 50% which is equal to 25%. If you toss a coin the third time, chances that you will be correct all three times is ( $1/2 \times 1/2 \times 1/2$ ) that is  $1/8$  or 50% of 50% of 50% that is  $12\frac{1}{2}\%$ .

A dice has got six sides. If you throw a dice and guess any number between 1 to 6, the chances that your guess will be correct is  $1/6$ . If you throw the dice the second time, the chances that your guess will be correct in both the throws is ( $1/6 \times 1/6$ ) which is equal to  $1/36$ . If you throw the dice the third time, the chances that all your three guesses are correct is ( $1/6 \times 1/6 \times 1/6$ ) is equal to  $1/216$  that is less than 0.5 %.

Let us apply this theory of probability to the Qur'an, and assume that a person has guessed all the information that is mentioned in the Qur'an which was unknown at that time. Let us discuss the probability of all the guesses being simultaneously correct.

At the time when the Qur'an was revealed, people thought the world was flat, there are several other options for the shape of the earth. It could be triangular, it could be quadrangular, pentagonal, hexagonal, heptagonal, octagonal, spherical, etc. Let's assume there are about 30 different options for the shape of the earth. The Qur'an rightly says it is spherical, if it was a

guess the chances of the guess being correct is 1/30.

The light of the moon can be its own light or a reflected light. The Qur'an rightly says it is a reflected light. If it is a guess, the chances that it will be correct is 1/2 and the probability that both the guesses i.e. the earth is spherical and the light of the moon is reflected light is  $1/30 \times 1/2 = 1/60$ .

Further, the Qur'an also mentions every living thing is made of water. Every living thing can be made up of either wood, stone, copper, aluminum, steel, silver, gold, oxygen, nitrogen, hydrogen, oil, water, cement, concrete, etc. The options are say about 10,000. The Qur'an rightly says that everything is made up of water. If it is a guess, the chances that it will be correct is 1/10,000 and the probability of all the three guesses i.e. the earth is spherical, light of moon is reflected light and everything is created from water being correct is  $1/30 \times 1/2 \times 1/10,000 = 1/60,000$  which is equal to about .0017%.

The Qur'an speaks about hundreds of things that were not known to men at the time of its revelation. Only in three options the result is .0017%. I leave it up to you, to work out the probability if all the hundreds of the unknown facts were guesses, the chances of all of them being correct guesses simultaneously and there being not a single wrong guess. It is beyond human capacity to make all correct guesses without a single mistake, which itself is sufficient to prove to a logical person that the origin of the Qur'an is Divine.

### CREATOR IS THE AUTHOR OF THE QUR'AN

The only logical answer to the question as to who could have mentioned all these scientific facts 1,400 years ago before they were discovered, is exactly the same answer initially given by the atheist or any person, to the question who will be the first person who will be able to tell the mechanism of the unknown object. It is the 'CREATOR', the producer, the Manufacturer of the whole universe and its contents. In the English language He is 'God', or more appropriate in the Arabic language, 'ALLAH'.

### QUR'AN IS A BOOK OF SIGNS AND NOT SCIENCE

Let me remind you that the Qur'an is not a book of Science, 'S-C-I-E-N-C-E' but a book of Signs 'S-I-G-N-S' i.e. a book of ayaats. The Qur'an contains more than 6,000 ayaats, i.e. 'signs', out of which more than a thousand speak about Science. I am not trying to prove that the Qur'an is the word of God using scientific knowledge as a yardstick because any yardstick is supposed to be more superior than what is being checked or verified. For us Muslims the Qur'an is the Furqan i.e. criteria to judge right from wrong and the ultimate yardstick which is more superior to scientific knowledge.

But for an educated man who is an atheist, scientific knowledge is the ultimate test which he believes in. We do know that science many a times takes 'U' turns, therefore I have restricted the examples only to scientific facts which have sufficient proof and evidence and not scientific theories based on assumptions. Using the ultimate yardstick of the atheist, I am trying to prove to him that the Qur'an is the word of God and it contains the scientific knowledge which is his yardstick which was discovered recently, while the Qur'an was revealed 1400 year ago. At the end of the discussion, we both come to the same conclusion that God though superior to science, is not incompatible with it.

### SCIENCE IS ELIMINATING MODELS OF GOD BUT NOT GOD

Francis Bacon, the famous philosopher, has rightly said that a little knowledge of science makes man an atheist, but an in-depth study of science makes him a believer in God. Scientists today are eliminating models of God, but they are not eliminating God. If you translate this into Arabic, it is La illaha illal la, There is no god, (god with a small 'g' that is fake god) but God (with a capital 'G').

### Surah Fussilat

"Soon we will show them our signs in the (farthest) regions (of the earth), and in their own souls, until it becomes manifest to them that this is the Truth. Is it not enough that thy Lord doth witness all things?" -- [Al-Quran 41:53]

To become a Muslim, just make a declaration sincerely that, 'there is none worthy of worship except Allah, and Muhammad is a messenger of Allah'.

Questions on the truth of Islam welcomed! Don't be shy!

Peace

To discover more about Islam, visit:

[www.islam-guide.com/](http://www.islam-guide.com/)

[www.quranexplorer.com/quran](http://www.quranexplorer.com/quran)

**TO which I responded:**

**I do not refute the existence of god, just merely that a god that requires worship and people on their knees and fearful of him is no true god at all.**

Thank you for your reply!

It's a natural instinct to believe in God just as it's a natural instinct to be attracted to the opposite sex. No atheist can claim that God doesn't exist 100%!

When a child is born, it has with it a natural belief in God. This natural belief is called in Arabic the "Fitrah". If the child were left alone, it would grow up aware of God in His oneness, but all children are affected by the pressures of their environment whether directly or indirectly. The Prophet, may the mercy and blessings of God be upon him, reported that God said, "I created My servants in the right religion but the devils made them go astray."

The Prophet also said, "Each child is born in a state of "Fitrah", but his parents make him a Jew or a Christian. It is like the way an animal gives birth to a normal offspring. Have you noticed any (young animal) born mutilated before you mutilate them?"

God Almighty Allah is a supreme Creator and cannot be seen by the mortal eyes. His existence is proven by His manifestation around us i.e. the created things. He is outside His creation and HENCE NOT SUBJECT TO THE LAWS OF NATURE.

You put yourself at great risk and danger when you die and you discover that the next life exists. So do give yourself a chance.

God says: "As for those who believe (in the Oneness of Allâh Islâmic Monotheism) and do righteous good deeds, for them are Gardens (Paradise) as an entertainment, for what they used to do (19) And as for those who are Fâsiqûn (disbelievers and disobedient to Allâh), their abode will be the Fire, everytime they wish to get away therefrom, they will be put back thereto, and it will be said to them: 'Taste you the torment of the Fire which you used to deny.' (20) of chapter 32 Quran translation.

<http://www.quranexplorer.com/quran/>

**My response:**

"I created My servants in the right religion but the devils made them go astray."

**So we are God's servants?**

\*\*\*\*\*

"So we are God's servants?"

Yes. Man is a slave by nature. If you are not a slave to God, then you are a slave to the creation.

\*\*\*\*\*

Holy Shit. Now I really see why they are so inclined to serve their God. I have never heard anything like this from a Muslim. Kind of scares the shit out of me.

OUR COMMENT: Muslims DO NOT believe that the Earth was spherical and that the moon reflects the light of the sun, even though ancient Greek pagan infidels discovered these facts 1,000 YEARS before the Koran was written. The Koran actually says that the Earth is flat (!) and that the moon is an independent source of light (!). The Koran asserts that planets and stars hide when they're not needed. It says that planetary orbits are semi-circular. It says the Earth is stationary at the centre of the universe and that the Sun revolves around it. It says that there's a stack of flat-disc Earths. It says that invisible genies (jinn) made of smokeless fire share the world

with us. The Koran contains no scientifically accurate information, and a host of direct contradictions of science. Even though it is allegedly written by the designer of the cosmos, it contains endless errors, many of them almost comical in their absurdity, and did not predict even one thing that science has discovered since it was written. The knowledge it contains is *exactly* that associated with badly-educated, illiterate Arabs of the seventh century. The only people who take the Koran seriously in the 21<sup>st</sup> century are badly-educated, brainwashed people, many of them as illiterate as Mohammed himself. He is truly their spokesman.

**[For them that] do righteous good deeds, for them are Gardens (of Paradise) as an entertainment...And for those who are (disbelievers and disobedient to Allâh), their abode will be the Fire.**

Same old Torture God threats – “Obey me or burn in Hell!” No wonder the Muslims are all terrorists given that they worship the God of Terror.

**“Yes. Man is a slave by nature. If you are not a slave to God, then you are a slave to the creation.”**

There you have it – Muslims are slaves, and think it’s an unavoidable condition. They have absolutely no understanding of the concept of freedom. They follow a religion called SUBMISSION (“Islam”), so we shouldn’t be surprised that these slaves have never once encountered the idea of freedom.

WAKE UP! The Muslims are evil. They worship the Torture God, they threaten everyone who rejects him, they have no relationship at all with freedom and are entirely ignorant of science. They are breeding at a frightening rate. War against Islam is unquestionably coming and you had better know what side you’re on. If the help of the OWO is needed to beat down the Islamic army of darkness and evil, so be it.

This is why 9/11 is such a big deal. If you don’t recognise that Muslim Jihadists were its authors then you have no idea of the enemy you are facing.

That Norwegian nutcase knew the score. He was deranged, but his psychopathic, unpardonable conduct doesn’t alter the fact that the West had better start facing up fast to the Islamic threat or we’ll all end up having to listen to the drivel of the Koran and pray to the Torture God five times a day.

Now we see that Muslims are actively trying to convert atheists. All over the world, vulnerable, badly-educated, superstitious people are being bullied into becoming Muslims.

Muslims have no shame or doubt. They don’t consider for a single second that it’s bad to be stupid, to be a slave, to be a follower of a Torture God whose only tactic to get people to comply with his whims is to threaten them with eternal hellfire. If he’s such a great, loving, merciful and compassionate God as the Muslims claim then why doesn’t he prove it by abolishing Hell and removing his threats of infinite and perpetual violence and punishment? It’s because he knows that if he’s not the God of Terror then he’s NOTHING! Who would kneel to this sad fuck of a “God” if he had no threats to deliver to his slave worshippers? Well, we are not slaves, and we aren’t afraid of a God so pathetic that he has to threaten people. Only cowards would kneel to this monster. He must resisted by all people who cherish freedom and dignity.

If Muslims take over the West, freedom will be dead. There is no greater and more violent threat in this world than Islam, the religion of the Devil. What Muslims call “paradise” is what all the rest of us would call Hell.

The War is surely coming. It’s time to get ready.

Nietzsche predicted that the greatest wars of history would be fought in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The twentieth century lived up to his billing. But the coming wars of this century will be on an unimaginable scale and ferocity – because they will be religious wars. They will also be the final wars, the wars that reveal what humanity’s true values are – slavery and evil or freedom and reason.

Nietzsche asserted that nihilism would be the cause of the meltdown, but nihilism is just religion that no longer believes in itself. The fundamental issue is what is the purpose of life when all the old religions are no longer credible, when capitalism offers nothing but soulless consumerism, when scientific materialism turns us into meaningless automata? We tell you this. Illuminism is the ONLY thing that stands between humanity and the abyss. Illuminism is the only rational religion. Illuminism alone provides the true values and purpose of the human race. Either the Illuminati triumph, or the evolution of humanity ends and civilisation collapses as unprecedented wars of spiritual crisis convulse our world.

By 2050, the cataclysm will be here. The dialectic speaks. Its final workings must transform the world, or see it utterly destroyed. That is the cosmic equation. If humanity fails to step up, it will be left to another species on another planet to become Gods and dictate the future of the cosmos. Survival is not compulsory!

“What I relate is the history of the next two centuries. I describe what is coming, what can no longer come differently: the advent of nihilism. This history can be related even now; for necessity itself is at work here. The future speaks even now in a hundred signs, this destiny announces itself everywhere; for this music of the future all ears are cocked even now. For some time now, our whole European culture has been moving as toward a catastrophe, with a tortured tension that is growing from decade to decade: restlessly, violently, headlong, like a river that wants to reach the end, that no longer reflects, that is afraid to reflect...For why has the advent of nihilism become necessary? Because the values we have had hitherto thus draw their final consequence; because nihilism represents the ultimate logical conclusion of our great values and ideals – because we must experience nihilism before we can find out what value these ‘values’ really had. We require, sometime, new values.” -- Nietzsche

Before the New World Order – where all values have been revalued – can come into being, the Old World Order must perish. Abrahamism must die. The privileged elites must be swept aside. A new human race is required for the new world, an enlightened humanity. There’s no place for faith, superstition, irrationality, ignorance, slavery and privilege.

All the values that have hitherto sustained our world must be cast into outer darkness. All those who can’t evolve, who can’t adapt, will fight to the death to preserve the old madness. Jews and Muslims will literally kill to protect their “right” to mutilate baby boys. There will never be a new world if these backward servants of the Devil are victorious.

### **How would you convert a Muslim?**

You wouldn’t bother. Muslims are brainwashed and irrational. They cannot understand science, mathematics and philosophy. Muslims spend all of their time trying to convince themselves that the Koran is right and none at all trying to pick holes in it (of which there are infinitely many). The Koran is a perfect instrument of mind control. Muslims are too scared to challenge the Koran. They think they will go to hell if they doubt the Koran – because it says so in the Koran! Therefore they do not challenge the Koran. Q.E.D.

### **The Seven Deadly Sins – the Worst Ideas in History**

- 1) Judaism
- 2) Islam
- 3) Christianity
- 4) Karma (in particular, its influence on the caste system)
- 5) Monarchy
- 6) Capitalism
- 7) Communism

Imagine if these horrors had never been inflicted on the human race. Would we not now be living in Paradise? These are the true seven deadly sins, the catastrophic errors of the human race.

But we always have the option of correcting our mistakes. The world can be purged of these deadly sins.

### **The Mission**

WE WERE ASKED WHAT our primary political goal is. The answer is simple: *FREEDOM*. We want everyone on Earth to be brought up freely and to live freely in a free world.

In childhood, all children must be free of pressures coming from their parents, from their peers, from ancient traditions (religions of fear and punishment, in particular), from communities, from societies, from bad governments, from privileged elites, from oppressive States. Above all, they must be free to construct their own identities based on their own characters, personalities, natures, tastes and talents, regardless of what anyone else thinks. No one should be cursed to endure an identity imposed on them by others (parents, peers, traditions or States).

To go through your life with a fake identity is to live in bad faith, to be inauthentic, to be alienated from yourself. You will never be happy in those circumstances. You will never be creative. You will never achieve what you are capable of and make a positive contribution to society. Mid-life crises are often triggered by people realising they have been living phoney lives according to others' rules, and now time is running out to be their true self.

The best society is the freest society. Society will achieve optimal progress only when everyone is free. Imagine what seven billion free people operating at full capacity could accomplish? Is there anything humanity couldn't do?

Our ultimate conception of freedom is encapsulated by God. Who is freer than God? God is the omega point of freedom, the conclusion of the cosmic dialectic of freedom. To be ultimately free, each of us must aspire to BECOME GOD.

To the Illuminati, becoming God and absolute freedom are one and the same thing. A world of freedom is a divine world. There are sinister forces of control all around us: especially religions and super rich elites who have no desire for the people to be free. It suits them very well to have an enslaved population over whom they have total power and control. At all times, the controllers are seeking to enforce and extend their control. They are the absolute enemies of the people. They are tyrants, and all tyrants must be toppled in the name of the people and of freedom.

What is Illumination? It is the gospel of freedom. Any God who frightens you, who threatens you, who demands obedience and worship from you, IS NOT GOD. Humanity will never be free until it has no fear of God, of rulers, governments, managers, parents or anyone else.

ALL of the problems of the world are solved by freedom. The sole legitimate function of government is to construct the State in which freedom is optimised. Once that is achieved, everything else automatically falls into place.

The biggest challenge is to make people wake up to the realisation that although many of them think they are free, they are not free at all. Anyone brought up as a Jew, Christian or Muslim never had the freedom to be anything else. Their identity was forced on them and brainwashed into them. Most of these people associate their constructed identity with freedom. Jews want to be free to be Jews, even though they were given no free choice in the matter in the first place. If people understand that they can never be free if they have had an identity imposed on them by others, they will start to grasp the nature of true freedom, and they will start campaigning for everyone to have the right to discover their own identity rather than having it branded on them as if they were cattle or sheep.

## **Circumcision**

RUSSELL CROWE was forced to apologise for criticising the evil ritual of circumcision. Via Twitter, he said the procedure was "barbaric and stupid" but later deleted his comments and said, "I'm very sorry that I have said things on here that have caused distress. My personal beliefs aside, I realise that some will interpret this... as me mocking rituals and traditions of others. I am very sorry."

What a fucking coward. His original statement was completely correct. Why didn't he stand by it? Perhaps because he feared that Hollywood's circumcised Jewish mafia would destroy his career?

Circumcision is indeed "barbaric and stupid" and ought to be outlawed for anything other than medical necessity. It's an unacceptable practice in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

All talk of circumcision being good for hygiene (or whatever else) is Jewish (and Islamic) nonsense. Evolution wouldn't have furnished a foreskin if it served no purpose.

Thanks to the propaganda of the beauty industry, people forget that there was a time when humanity had no soap or shampoo (and nor do animals have such things) but evolution came up with hygiene systems that don't require people to pay money to rich capitalists. Hair, for example, is self-cleansing if left alone.

The beauty industry has made us despise our own naturalness, purely to enrich the people

with products to sell. Similarly, people invent reasons to justify circumcision. There's no justification. It's bodily mutilation for the sake of religious branding and control. End of story.

\*\*\*\*\*

All members of the American Congress should be asked whether it's consistent with the American Constitution for innocent, defenceless babies to have part of their body removed for no other reason than to satisfy the religious superstitions of their parents. Is that what American "freedom" is? – the right of parents to abuse their children with impunity in the name of primitive religious beliefs? Whatever happened to consent? To individual freedom?

Abraham Lincoln brought about the emancipation of slaves. Where is the new Abraham Lincoln who will free baby boys from their tyranny of their parents? It is UNACCEPTABLE for babies to be mutilated because of mad ideas in their heads of their brainwashed parents. Fuck all religions that think they can get away with branding babies.

THEY MUST BE STOPPED!

## War on Five Fronts

THE ILLUMINATI are engaged in the most difficult of all wars, a war on five fronts. We are fighting:

- 1) Abrahamism – the Jews, Christians and Muslims.
- 2) Privileged elites – the Old World Order.
- 3) The Eastern concept of karma.
- 4) Nihilistic scientific materialism.
- 5) Irrational conspiracy theorists.

Has there ever been such a war? Has any group ever taken on such odds? We have just one weapon – the truth. And in that sign we shall surely conquer. We are the army of the dialectic, and in the end the dialectic crushes all opposition.

## The Watergate Advice

IN THE MOVIE *All the President's Men* about Woodward and Bernstein's heroic fight to reveal the truth about Watergate, "Deep Throat" advised them to "follow the money". In fact, virtually all of life is about following the money. Money is the currency of power. Those who have a lot of it control those who have little of it. If you want an equitable society, you have to ensure that the ability to acquire money (power) is strictly regulated. In a just, meritocratic society, following the money should lead to nowhere in particular because money will no longer be a signifier of power.

## Anathema

THERE'S NO SUCH THING as rational debate in Christianity. When anyone disagrees with the establishment, an "anathema" is placed on them.

In relation to Jesus Christ, the Church says: "But as for those who say that there was a time when He was not, and that before He was begotten He was not, and that He came into being from things that were not, or who affirm that the Son of God is of a different subsistence or essence, or created, subject to change or alteration, them the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematizes."

Note the total absence of any intellectual response to the challenge of the heretics. Where *was* the Son before he was begotten? Isn't that an entirely valid question deserving of a truthful and rational answer? Instead, the Church prepares the stakes and gets ready for a burning party!

If the average Christian can't engage in a debate over Christian theology, of what account is their faith? If they don't actually know what they believe but just take it on trust, haven't they

declared themselves dunces and fools? What God would ever want followers who don't care what he is or what he stands for but "believe" just because some "holy man" told them to?!

Tertullian famously said: "*Credo quia absurdum*" (I believe because it is absurd). Albert Camus may have claimed the title of philosopher of the absurd, but Tertullian got there long before he did. Christians are absurdists. Their religion is absurd, their triune God is absurd, their beliefs are absurd and their contempt for reason is absurd.

## **Before the Incarnation**

ACCORDING TO THE LOGIC of Christianity, everyone who lived from the time of Adam and Eve to the death and resurrection of Christ went to Hell no matter how good or evil they were (apart from Enoch and Elijah who allegedly ascended directly to Heaven). All of the Chosen People went to Hell (apart from Enoch and Elijah). Abraham, Moses, David, Joseph, Isaac and all the rest were denied salvation, unless God had a list of exceptions to his rule.

The examples of Enoch and Elijah must be rather disturbing to Christians. If they were admitted to Heaven before the Incarnation then plainly Jesus Christ is not essential to salvation, which rather defeats the point of Christianity. If all the other prophets and kings of Israel were admitted to Heaven then surely Christianity has no point at all. God is willing to grant salvation to some people, regardless of Jesus Christ.

Logically, Christianity is complete nonsense. Either no one was admitted to heaven before Christ (meaning that every Biblical "hero" and loyal believer in Yahweh went to Hell), or Christ is not essential to Salvation. Perhaps the Pope would like to tell the world the answer. After all, isn't that his job?

If all Jews went to Hell prior to Christ's sacrifice (because they were stained with Original Sin) and all Jews went to Hell after Christ's sacrifice because they rejected Christ (and had not received Christian baptism to combat Original Sin), doesn't it mean that ALL Jews are in Hell? The Jews are literally the damned, a race bred for Hell (and yet they're supposed to be the Chosen people!).

Would the Pope like to go to Jerusalem and announce to the Jews that not a single dead Jew is in Heaven and in fact they're all burning in Hell (apart from Enoch and Elijah, who went to Heaven without bothering to die first)? Wouldn't that be the HONEST thing to do? Of course, we know that the Pope and his ilk don't do honesty. They don't have an honest bone on their bodies. They never engage in theological disputes (because they know they'll lose and be humiliated) and they have no regard at all for the truth.

Similarly, monarchs never engage in any political debates about the purpose, function and legitimacy of monarchy. The Queen of the UK, the head of State of Britain, is unaccountable to any of her "subjects" and never has to answer any of their questions or be in any way answerable to them. And the UK has the impudence to call itself a democracy.

Why are all the important debates never had? Why does the establishment ensure that all important issues are suppressed and all important questions ignored? We know the answer: awkward debates and questions would destroy the myth of the establishment. The rule of the establishment is based on nothing but smoke and mirrors. It's just the *Wizard of Oz* on a global scale.

But an extremely disturbing thought arises. In this world of ours, people are so brainwashed that it wouldn't make any difference to pull back the curtain and reveal the truth of the Wizard of Oz. The servile masses would go on believing exactly as before. They want to. They love it. The truth doesn't matter to them in the slightest. The fantasy is everything. They would stare at the naked Emperor in his set of new clothes and they would agree with him that his non-existent clothes were the finest they had ever seen.

That's the world we live in.

## **Jewish Toilet Paper**

IN A TV DOCUMENTARY, an ultra-Orthodox Jewish woman wearing a wig (as required by her God who seems rather fixated on human or artificial hair for some weird reason), said that she won't tear toilet paper on the Sabbath because that would constitute "work" and hence deserve the death penalty according to Jewish holy law, so she makes sure there's a supply of *pre-torn* tissues.

What manner of God cares whether someone wipes their ass with torn or non-torn tissue? Are these Jews psychotic? Who would want to believe in their mad, dirty-ass God? Consider the poverty of imagination that conceives of God, the cosmic Creator, as being preoccupied with



toilet paper.

The woman said that she has to invite non-Jews around on the Sabbath to switch on lights for her since her religions forbids it. She thinks she will go to Hell if she switches on a light, but she's perfectly happy for non-Jews to commit a mortal sin, implying that she couldn't care less whether they go to Hell. In other words, she uses the "damned" to do her Sunday chores for her. What kind of morality is that?

Jews create self-imposed ghettos that alienate them from everyone else. Then they say: "We stay away from the outside world because it hasn't been kind to us." And thus they make it much more likely that the outside world will treat them badly. No wonder it was a Jew who invented *Catch 22*.

Apparently there's a new trend in tradition-directed religions such as Judaism and Islam. Teenagers either want out of the religion completely or they want the most authentic (i.e. extreme) version of the religion possible. There's no desire at all to reform these religions and bring them into the modern age. People want extremism or nothing. The middle ground, if it ever existed with these extremist religions, has vanished. These religions will never become enlightened. Hell will freeze over before the Jews or Muslims get anywhere near the world of reason.

We say to all Jewish and Muslim teenagers: see the light – abandon your mad religion and your mad God. Who but a lunatic would worship a God who takes note of your toilet paper usage?! He's the biggest ASS in history. Stop worshipping him. Use your reason, if your brainwashing parents have accidentally allowed you to have any.

## **What we're up against**

IN ISLAM, the Prophet Mohammed performs the same role as Jesus Christ. Although Muslims deny that they worship Mohammed, you need only look at the expression on the faces of women at the Hazratbal Shrine in Kashmir when they are gazing at a particular holy relic: hair, supposedly, from Mohammed's beard. It's exactly the same as the look on the faces of Christian women in the presence of relics of Christ or the Virgin Mary.

The Kashmir hair is almost certainly fake and even if it's genuine, so what? Who in their right mind would be elevated to ecstasy at the sight of some ancient hair? It's not the hair that matters, of course. It's what it signifies. These people believe they are somehow in the living presence of their God Mohammed.

One can infer that the IQ of these women is staggeringly low, that they have received almost no education and they have been brainwashed and indoctrinated by Islam since birth.

It's the biggest challenge of all to overcome this system of absolute mind control. Imagine the fight these people would put up rather than enter the world of reason, logic and enlightenment. They are as far from the light as it's possible to get.

## **The Death of the Church of England?**

SOME PROJECTIONS ARE POINTING to the extinction of the Church of England within the next twenty years. The average age of the congregations is already 61. Within twenty years, these people will be dead, and there are too few new worshippers joining the Church to replace them.

It doesn't take much for a Church to die. All that's required is for one generation to turn its back and the Church is fatally wounded. As soon as the brainwashing system ceases to operate effectively, the religion is finished.

The leaders of the Church of England are well-known as a group of rather ineffectual liberals, some of whom openly doubt the central tenets of Christianity such as the Virgin Birth and even the Resurrection itself.

A group associated with the Church of England openly said that it didn't matter if Christianity were completely false: it would still be valuable to act as if it were true. Once a religion has reached this state, it has no future. People no longer know what they believe or why and they just make it up as they go along. No young people, looking for authenticity, are likely to be inspired by people play-acting at believing.

## **Smoking and Abrahamism**

ABRAHAMISM IS JUST LIKE SMOKING – a terrible vice to which people are addicted despite all the rational evidence that the practice is extremely damaging to their health. Smokers have "faith" that all of the horrors of smoking-related diseases will somehow miraculously bypass

them. They will talk of the aged relative who has smoked 40-a-day all of his life and is as fit as a fiddle. That's what addiction does to you – makes you talk shit. You arrive at the conclusion you always wanted to arrive at: to keep on smoking regardless of the harm it's doing to you. Smokers enjoy smoking, so they won't give up. It's THAT simple.

Similarly, Abrahamists never abandon their beliefs even though they themselves are aware of how foolish they are. They don't care about reason. They don't care about truth. Abrahamism comforts them. It gives them an identity. It allows them some kind of understanding of the world (even if it's an entirely Mythos-based, fictional understanding). They like what Abrahamism brings them. They're addicted to it. They'll never give it up if they're allowed any choice in the matter, just as smokers don't give up without laws being imposed on them.

Smoking is bad for your health and many States and nations have introduced bans on smoking in public places.

Abrahamism is bad for your mental health, and for the health of truth and reason. Where are the State and national bans on Abrahamism?

Governments take measures to protect the physical health of citizens. They ignore the much more important issue – the mental health of their citizens. It is essential for the State to promote truth and reason in the interests of producing a better-educated, more talented and creative workforce. Abrahamism is a catastrophic threat to mental wellbeing. It is based on delusion and fantasy rather than truth and reason.

Smoking and Abrahamism seriously damage your physical and mental health. People are often addicted to what harms them, and rarely addicted to what's good for them. This desire for self-harm ultimately flows from low self-esteem, and Abrahamism is excellent at infecting people with a sense of worthlessness that can be addressed only by "God". In fact, that's its purpose: to make you feel shit and then promise to save you.

## **The Deadly Whale as the Abrahamist God**

### **"I have written a wicked book." -- Herman Melville**

*MOBY DICK* BY HERMAN MELVILLE is one of the truly great books. It's a tale of an indestructible, evil "God" – the great white whale – that brings death and horror to all who oppose it. Melville described his book as being "broiled in hell-fire." In his Bible, he underlined Exodus 15:3: "The Lord is a man of war."

Melville, raised within the Calvinist tradition – the truly deranged wing of Christianity – concluded that it wasn't Adam that caused man's fall but God himself. God was the Original Sinner, the creator of evil, the arch-fiend.

Captain Ahab, anti-hero of *Moby Dick*, was "dismasted of a leg" by the whale on a previous voyage and burned with the desire for revenge. He baptized, with the blood of his pagan harpooners, the harpoon he intended to use to kill the whale. Mocking the Christian baptism, he declared: "Ego non baptizo te in nomine patris sed nomine diaboli" ("I baptize you not in the name of the father, but in the name of the devil"). Of course, the "devil" in this context is on the side of good since it is the abominable whale that is evil.

In the Bible, Ahab was a king of Israel who worshipped pagan gods and was married to the infamous Jezebel. When he died in battle, dogs and pigs licked his blood. When Melville chose Ahab as the name of his anti-hero, he was signalling that this man was no friend of the Calvinist God.

*Moby Dick* is a vast allegory about the hateful Calvinist God and Ahab's obsessive attempts to thwart him at any cost. Ahab's opposition to the monster becomes as implacable as the monster itself. Ahab will never yield to this sea-borne Satan. Although Ahab seems fanatical, he has every reason to be so given the dark power he is confronting.

*Cetology* – the study of whales – becomes a code for theology. In *Melville's Quarrel with God*, writer Lawrance Thompson said: "Melville's entire artistic contrivance in *Moby Dick* is his own esoteric and cabalistic commentary on God." In truth, it is largely a Gnostic interpretation of the world with *Moby Dick* as the evil Demiurge.

Who can deny the ingenuity of Melville's probing of the nature of God via whales and whaling? There is something about the vast oceans, the merciless storms, the incredible risks taken by the whalers, the death of either the hunted or the hunters, that is perfectly suited to divine discourse.

The tale of *Moby Dick* is narrated, famously, by Ishmael. Like Ishmael in the Koran, spared from being killed by his father Abraham, Ishmael in *Moby Dick* is spared, having looked death

straight in the eye.

Ahab failed in his heroic odyssey to destroy the Monster, the Leviathan, but one day the harpoons will strike home and Moby Dick will perish. Then we can build a statue to Captain Ahab, one of the noblest enemies of Jehovah.

## **Getting Ahead**

IN THE UK, one in four families pay for extra tuition for their children. The families that can afford it can secure an advantage for their children. For children with poor parents, they are immediately placed at a disastrous competitive disadvantage. Is it not completely unacceptable for children's futures to be dependent on the wealth of their parents? Is that not yet another assault on the liberty of the individual?

The wealthy parents think they have the right to help their children to "get ahead". But do they also have the right to sabotage other children? Who gave them such a right to ruin the lives of others? The wealth of some is actually being used as a weapon against others to reduce their scope for freedom. How can that be tolerated? How can it be deemed legal and moral?

There are no winners without losers. No one can complain about the winner in a fair race, but everyone can and should complain about a rigged race. It should be the central duty of the State to guarantee all children exactly the same educational opportunities, regardless of parental wealth.

Privilege must be abolished in every one of its manifestations. It is immoral and anti-libertarian in every conceivable way.

## **Decay, Decadence and Degeneration**

THERE IS A THEORY that the destiny of upwardly socially mobile families is made or broken in just three generations.

Stage 1: The first generation makes a heap of money through some fabulous entrepreneurial feat, but the first generation is regarded as "new money" by the existing elite and treated with disdain.

Stage 2: The second generation are sent to the best schools and colleges (where the elite go) and thus consolidate the family's new social status (although they are still sneered at by the elite).

Stage 3: The rot sets in. The third generation are now accepted by the elite – to the great satisfaction of the second generation – but the well-off third generation rebel against the respectable second generation (with their ghastly obsession with social climbing and status) and become alcoholics, drug addicts, gamblers, sex addicts and so on. All of the family's money may be squandered and the family may return to the gutter from which they first sprang, and may in fact die out since the third generation often have no children.

If the family dynasty can ward off this fate then they can join the privileged elite and become a permanent fixture. Many of the features of this rise and fall of the family are illustrated by the American Kennedy clan.

The privileged elite invariably become decadent and degenerate but if they can consolidate their wealth then they will be around for centuries despite retaining none of the merit of the first generation that made the initial big breakthrough.

In a meritocratic society, the second generation would never get the chance to become smug social climbers, and the third would never be allowed to fall into degeneracy. In a meritocracy, there would be no family dynasty at all. In a meritocracy, all families are continually reset to zero by the imposition of a 100% inheritance tax – all of the money of the dead is surrendered to the Commonwealth of the People. This is the only way to guarantee universal liberty and prevent the rise of privileged elites who deprive others of freedom through the systematic use of money as a weapon.

## **Motivation for the Rich**

RICH PEOPLE SAY that they have to be given enormous "compensation" to motivate them to do their demanding jobs in luxury offices. Rich people also say that poor people doing horrible, demanding, demeaning, tedious, repetitive, soul-destroying menial jobs in sweatshops do *not* need to be motivated by enormous compensation.

Why is it that rich people, often doing work that they find extremely enjoyable and which provides them with enviable status, power and prestige, need huge salaries while they think that people doing hard, repellent jobs no one would ever do if they had a choice, and which give them no status, power or prestige, don't need financial motivation at all?

Surely the highest paid jobs should be the LEAST desirable, yet it turns out that it's the worst, grimmest jobs that are the lowest paid. There is an INVERSE relationship between financial "motivation" and the undesirability of a job i.e. you get no financial motivation to do shit jobs, and you get enormous financial motivation to do the great jobs everyone wants. WTF!

## **The Absurd Religions**

WE HAVE SHOWN THAT the Abrahamist religions in general and Christianity in particular are morally, rationally and theologically absurd. They have in fact been refuted in every conceivable way. So why are they still standing? Why haven't they vanished into oblivion, the fate they so richly deserve?

It's because these religions have in fact no connection with religion at all. If they were religions, they would be destroyed by their moral and theological contradictions and the fact that science has refuted their cosmological claims. They endure because they are concerned with psychology, not religion. They are perfect brainwashing machines. People are infected with the Abrahamist toxins when they are babies, and the virus is then with them forever. Few people can beat the virus and recover their natural health.

People's identities are constructed around their religious beliefs. To challenge their belief system is to attack their identity. People don't know who they are. They don't know how to construct their own identity and define themselves as autonomous individuals. So they stay loyal to their discredited religions because they have nowhere else to go. Their identity would collapse without their religion.

That is the supreme genius of the religious virus – to ensure that it is inextricably linked with personal identity. People can't shake it off because they can't get rid of their own identity.

Mainstream religion is the most sinister and Satanic force that has ever afflicted the human race. It's the creation of the Devil and its whole point is to stop human beings from being free, independent, rational, self-defining, self-creating, autonomous individuals who cannot be controlled by the powers-that-be.

The Devil chose to control humanity via religion. Is that not the supreme irony? Is it not PURE GENIUS?

Mainstream religion should be regarded as a mental illness or a deadly virus that spreads through the population horrifically rapidly and which is terrifyingly infectious. Public health measures should be taken against it.

The cure is already known. Religious indoctrination must be made illegal. No one should have any religious affiliation until 16 years of age (or perhaps the appropriate age should be tied to the legal age for drinking alcohol since religion and alcohol are both potent, potentially destructive drugs; religious extremists are the equivalent of alcoholics, addicted to fanatical beliefs), at which point they can make a free choice regardless of the wishes of the State, community or family. If they want to be atheists, agnostics or skeptics, that's their choice. If they want to be witches, pagans, Jedi Knights or anything else, that's their business, no one else's.

IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION is the key to the human race. The State must provide a framework in which children evolve their own identity according to their own tastes, personality, character and nature. All forces seeking to manipulate them or force them in any particular direction must be blocked and resisted. People must be free to find themselves. It's not the business of peers, parents, traditions or the State to mould you according to their inclinations. It's an individual's right TO BECOME HIMSELF.

It's the State's duty to ensure that outcome, hence the State must fight any alternative source of identity construction, above all religion.

It's impossible to have a free world if the construction of identity is not a free process. Religion does everything in its power to prevent identity being freely chosen. Baby Jewish and Muslim boys, just eight days old, are circumcised to brand them. From then on the brainwashing and mind control to which they are subjected is simply relentless and horrifying. This process is the uttermost enemy of personal freedom and must be resisted by anyone who advocates human liberty.

There is no system more harmful to freedom than mainstream religion. In Islam, a person who memorizes the entire Koran is treated with great respect and is known as a *hafiz*. You wouldn't catch these brainwashed individuals memorizing anything useful such as a book on

science, philosophy or mathematics. They quite literally memorize pure nonsense from beginning to end – all thanks to the extreme regime of mind control manipulating them like helpless puppets.

Do you believe in freedom? Then STOP religious brainwashing. Make it illegal. Condemn it every moment of every day. Stop Islam, Judaism and Christianity in their tracks. Stop them from destroying the precious gift of liberty.

## **The New Age**

THE LAST 2,000 YEARS have been the Age of Belief. It has been a catastrophic age, an absolute disaster for the human race. Only one thing has gone right in the public sphere – the rise of science. With the exception of the Illuminati, only science has resisted the barbarian hordes of Abrahamism. It's now time for this accursed irrational, superstitious Age to be over. Now it's time for the dialectical replacement of the Age of Belief. It's time for the Age of Reason.

Just as the believers declared infidels anathema, an abomination and excommunicate, so must the same now be done to the believers themselves. Belief is unacceptable in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Reason must trample it into the ground without mercy.

All books of belief ought to be incinerated. They have done nothing but harm to humanity. For 2,000 years, they have delivered hate, intolerance and madness. Never have any books deserved to be burned more than the Torah, the Bible and the Koran. They have contributed zero to human progress. On the contrary, they have held humanity back at every turn. They have declared that the sun revolves around the earth, contrary to science. The Koran even declares the Earth to be flat!

Now it's time for the Scientific Inquisition. All belief systems hostile to science must be officially condemned and their practitioners ordered to stop preaching, or face jail. If Abrahamism can put Galileo under house arrest and burn Giordano Bruno to death, then science can surely return the favour.

If humanity wants to achieve its full potential, it must destroy belief and place its trust in reason and knowledge. The Age of Belief, the Jewish Age of Satan, has been a diabolical error. We must correct our mistake as soon as possible.

Being a believer must become a thing of shame. To declare belief in a false God and false prophets must be the ultimate stigma. The Believers showed no mercy and now no mercy should be shown to them. In one generation, the curse of Abrahamism should be lifted from the world and the power of Satan destroyed.

Reason will deliver us, nothing else.

This is the War of the Enlightenment, the war to revalue all the values of the human race and to abolish faith and superstition in favour of reason and knowledge. The Illuminati under the great Adam Weishaupt started it and now it's time to finish it.

The world needs a New Humanity – of the type envisaged by the great anti-Christian philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche. He set out his stall no more effectively than in his incendiary masterpiece *The Antichrist*. We have reproduced its astounding first pages, the opening salvo in the war to end all wars: the War of Values. What should the ultimate human values be? – slavery to the tyrannical God of Abrahamism, or absolute human FREEDOM.

## **The Antichrist by Friedrich Nietzsche**

### **(PREFACE)**

THIS BOOK BELONGS TO the rarest of men. Perhaps not one of them is even alive yet. Possibly they are the readers who understand my *Zarathustra*: how *could* I confound myself with those for whom there are ears listening today? – Only the day after tomorrow belongs to me. Some men are born posthumously.

The conditions under which any one understands me, and *necessarily* understands me—I know them all too well. One must be honest in intellectual matters to the point of harshness to endure my seriousness, my passion. One must be accustomed to living on mountain tops—to seeing the wretched ephemeral chatter of politics and national egoism *beneath* one. One must have become indifferent; one must never ask of the truth whether it brings profit or fatality.... One must have an inclination, born of strength, for questions that no one else has the courage for; the courage for the *forbidden*; predestination for the labyrinth. The experience of seven solitudes. New ears for new music. New eyes for what is most distant. A new conscience for truths that have

hitherto remained unheard. *And* the will to economize in the grand manner—to hold together one's strength, one's enthusiasm.... Reverence for oneself; love for oneself; absolute freedom for oneself....

Very well! These alone are my readers, my true readers, my predestined readers: of what account are the *rest*?—The rest are merely mankind.—One must be superior to mankind in power, in *loftiness* of soul,—in contempt. -- W. Nietzsche

## 1.

—Let us look one another in the face. We are Hyperboreans—we know well enough how remote our home is. “Neither by land nor by water shalt thou find the road to the Hyperboreans”: Pindar already knew *that* of us. Beyond the North, beyond the ice, beyond *death*—*our* life, *our* happiness.... We have discovered that happiness; we know the way; we have found the exit out of whole millennia of labyrinth. Who *else* has found it?—The man of today?—“I don't know either the way in or the way out; I am whatever doesn't know either the way in or the way out”—so sighs the man of today.... *This* is the sort of modernity that made us ill,—we sickened on lazy peace, cowardly compromise, the whole virtuous dirtiness of the modern Yea and Nay. This tolerance and *largeur* of the heart that “forgives” everything because it “understands” everything is a sirocco to us. Rather live amid the ice than among modern virtues and other such southwinds!... We were brave enough; we spared neither ourselves nor others; but we were a long time finding out *where* to direct our courage. We grew dismal; they called us fatalists. *Our* fate—it was the fullness, the tension, the *storing up* of powers. We thirsted for the lightnings and great deeds; we kept as far as possible from the happiness of the weakling, from “resignation”... There was thunder in our air; nature, as we embodied it, became overcast—*for we had not yet found the way*. The formula of our happiness: a Yea, a Nay, a straight line, a *goal*....

## 2.

What is good? All that heightens the feeling of power, the will to power, power itself in man.

What is bad? All that proceeds from weakness.

What is happiness? The feeling that power *increases* – that a resistance is overcome.

Not contentment, but more power; *not* peace at any price, but war; *not* virtue, but efficiency (virtue in the Renaissance sense, *virtu*, virtue free of moral acid).

The weak and the botched shall perish: first principle of *our* charity. And one shall help them to do so.

What is more harmful than any vice?—Active sympathy for the botched and the weak—Christianity....

## 3.

The problem I raise here is not what ought to replace mankind in the sequence of species (—man is an end—): but what type of man must be *bred*, must be *willed*, as being the most valuable, the most worthy of life, the most secure guarantee of the future.

This more valuable type has appeared often enough in the past: but always as a lucky accident, as an exception, never as *willed*. He has rather been the most feared; he has hitherto been virtually *the* thing to be feared—and out of fear the reverse type has been willed, bred and *attained*: the domestic animal, the herd animal, the sick animal man—the *Christian*....

## Conclusion

ARE YOU A CHRISTIAN? Then give up your disgusting, abhorrent faith *now*. It's intellectually and morally bankrupt. Your religion is false in every conceivable regard. There are no rational grounds whatever for being a Christian. You almost certainly have no idea of what Christianity actually is. You could never debate with us the intricacies of Christian theology and yet you're a Christian and we're not. Of what value is your Christian faith if you have no understanding of what you actually believe?

Christianity has been comprehensively disproved theologically, scientifically and rationally. All that remains is a ghost that haunts the imagination of those brainwashed by Christianity since birth. If you were never raised as a Christian, you would laugh at it. It's quite simply ludicrous: virgin births, the Creator of the Universe walking the earth and getting himself crucified, miracles, people coming back from the dead and so on. Come on, grow up. Leave childish stories

behind. Become an adult, for God's sake.

For 2,000 years, Christianity has stalked our world and filled it with hate, intolerance and violence. If you don't abandon it then you are personally responsible for it and all the horrors it has worked in our world. You become as evil as it unless you repudiate it.

Isn't it time for the truth? Isn't it time for the extinction of Christianity? Christ is dead and, in truth, he never lived in the first place. He was never anything other than a fiction, an imaginary friend for lost sheep. Look in the mirror. Are you a human being or one of the sheeple? Have some dignity. Embrace light and TRUTH, the *real* truth.

"What a theologian feels to be true *must* be false: this provides almost a criterion of truth." -- Nietzsche

"Christianity is a revolt of everything that crawls along the ground directed against that which is *elevated*." -- Nietzsche